

The Christian Statesman

Vol. XLIX.

OCTOBER, 1915.

No. 9

The Outlook

One who crosses our northern boundary finds himself at once in a new atmosphere. The god of war has reached across three thousand miles of sea, and laid his hand upon our Canadian neighbour. On the principal square of a small provincial city one is confronted by a bill board announcements: "The Empire needs you to win. Enlist now;" "Go, or do something." Cards appear in the windows of business houses urging the young men to heed the call of country and of duty. On the lawn of the English church a bulletin states that an intercessional service for sailors and soldiers will be held every Friday afternoon. Meetings of a patriotic character are held in the park and elsewhere. Convalescent soldiers, recently brought home wounded, are among the speakers. At a meeting in the armory to secure enlistments the English rector, the Roman Catholic priest, and army officers, spoke for their country from the same platform. A lady friend told us in her home of her son who had enlisted and gone to the training camp, and who was expected home for a farewell visit, but was called at once across the sea. In another home on a Saturday evening a heavy-hearted mother brought in the two boys yet remaining in her household, both of whom had enlisted and would start on Monday morning for the training camp. In another family two sons had been

killed; in another no word had come concerning the soldier son since March. War is in the air, more than in our own country, and in a different sense. It rests heavily on the hearts of the people. It is most prominent in their conversation, in the public press, and in the prayers of the sanctuary. It is their war. Canada is a part of the huge, living, moral organization, the British Empire. The Teutonic forces are assailing the mother country. The daughter has arisen in her defence. There is no conflict on Canadian soil, nor any ordinary likelihood that any will take place, but Canada is now at war. On one of the lake vessels a placard reads: "Britain is fighting for the freedom of Europe and to defend your mothers, wives, and sisters from the horrors of war. Enlist now." Canada is furnishing of her men and means for the defence of the great empire of which she is a part, and for what she firmly believes to be the cause of right and of humanity.



The number of soldiers already furnished by Canada for the present war is not remarkably large, but is after all a considerable force when her population of about seven millions is taken into consideration. An army of 200,000 from Canada would be about the equivalent of one of 2,800,000 from our nation with its 100,000,000 people. An edi-

Number of Soldiers

torial in the Toronto Globe with the caption, "Canada's Strength at the Front," contains the following words:

It is announced from Ottawa that a call will shortly be made for 50,000 additional recruits, thus raising the number of Canadians under arms to 200,000 men. The country would like more information than is now available as to the use made of the great army of well-trained men already sent abroad. The only Canadian troops now in France are the division of about 20,000 men under General Alderson. A second division is said to be in instant readiness at Shorncliffe, in the south of England, so that we may have 40,000 men actually at the front within a week or two. There has been a wastage of about 14,000 in killed, wounded, and missing, but, deducting this number from the total Canadian effectives, it does not seem that Canada will be doing her bit by keeping even 40,000 men at the front. The Australasians, with a population far smaller than that of the Dominion, have had 40,000 men engaged in the Dardanelles operations for several months.



Rumours of peace from different sources and of different kinds are naturally heard from time to time during the progress of the

Peace

Rumours

war. At the beginning

of last month Cardinal

Gibbons presented to

President Wilson a confidential communication from Pope Benedict requesting our government to co-operate with the Vatican and neutral nations to bring about peace in Europe. Whatever may be thought about the propriety of the Pope's efforts in this direction or of the desirability of such a peace as the Vatican might prefer, it cannot be denied that few persons in the world are able to exercise more influence in bringing about such a great international event than the head of

the Roman Catholic Church. A rumour also was heard at this same time that information received by the German embassy, apparently at Washington, indicated terms on which the imperial government would enter negotiations for peace.

In view of the awful nature of the present conflict the desire for peace is strong and universal, and should be the prayer of every patriot and cosmopolitan. Peace, if based on right conditions, cannot come too soon. It is true, however, that if either side in the war is willing to consider peace conditions at the present time, it is probably the Teutonic side, because of the progress thus far achieved by them. Peace at the present juncture would be a peace decidedly in favor of Germany. True she has been driven from the sea, has lost very heavily in her foreign possessions, failed in her drive on Paris, was driven back at the Marne, and has been unable to penetrate farther westward, but she holds Belgium to-day, a valuable part of France, has overwhelmingly defeated Russia, and has her own territory practically intact, with apparently great resources yet at her command. If Germany is right, peace now is desirable. If the Allies are on the side of right and humanity, it is difficult to perceive how peace at this juncture can be for the best interests of the world. Peace at any price may be far too dearly purchased.

A dispatch from London, also near the first of the month, stated that in high official circles there it was learned authoritatively that recent rumours of peace had no foundation in any step taken by the British government or in any statement issued there from authoritative sources. A

high official who declined permission to use his name, thus expressed himself in part:

I am inclined to believe that Germany is making some move in the direction of peace, but I can state that England has absolutely no intention of making at the present time any concessions other than those enunciated in Premier Asquith's famous Guild Hall speech on November 9 last, when he said the irreducible minimum of terms included the restoration of Belgium, security for France against aggression, the rights of existence for small nations and the overthrow of the Prussian military machine. Of course, the sole decision does not rest with England, as, for instance, France must judge what constitutes her safety from aggression.

The Toronto Globe, while perhaps not referring to the special peace proposals here discussed, contains in an editorial of last month the following words on the continuance of the war:

But those whose ideal is Peace and not War, whose hope is in Law and not in Force, are not at all blind to the necessity for mating army with army, navy with navy, bomb with bomb, until this accursed progeny of the war passion and lawlessness and brute force is taken out of the way. Now that the mad folly of militarism is exposed to all the world, no wise lover of justice and freedom and peace will counsel sheathing the sword until the mad dog in the world's front street is done to death. Disarmament for peaceful nations cannot precede the overthrow of the militarism and navalism of the war nations; it can only follow. What this war has proved, and proved up to the hilt, is that in the world's community of nations all must be either neighbors in a neighborhood or wild beasts in a jungle. World civilization means, not that one nation should disarm for peace, but that no nation should be allowed to arm for war.

Mr. Frank H. Simonds, a well known and able writer, in "One Year

of War," in the Review of Reviews for August, in discussing prospects of peace presents certain considerations, which, whether we wholly agree with them, are most interesting and worthy of careful consideration. He claims that peace to-day would leave Germany mistress of Europe. Industrially she would win through the fact that she has ruined the great manufacturing regions of Belgium, Northern France, and Poland, while her own factory districts are undisturbed. But politically her success, in his opinion, would be even more dangerous to the rest of Europe. Even if she now ceded back French and Russian territory and left Belgium, she would have put France outside the number of great powers. Neither France nor Belgium would again stand in the pathway of Germany. France would become a second-rate power, and Belgium a Teutonic outpost. For Germany, in addition to having occupied French and Belgian and Russian territory, has to all practical purposes absorbed Austria-Hungary and thereby added fifty millions to one central empire. He also says:

Such peace as is now possible, viewed from London, Paris, or Petrograd, would mean German domination of Europe. To Germany's foes it would mean the recognition of almost all of what Germany has sought, with the perfect realization that the rest would follow inevitably and at no distant date. Recalling how difficult has been the process to unite Russia, England, France, and Italy, who can believe it could be repeated or that Germany would fail to find one necessary temporary ally?

Americans will do well to recall the situation at the close of the first year of the Civil War. Then, any possible accommodation of the differences would have yielded the South that indepen-

dence which was its single aim. Peace now would concede to Germany quite as completely the goal of her leaders, of her statesmen, soldiers, and dreamers. It would, in the Allied view at least (and it is from this standpoint that we must look in discussing the prospects of peace), mean the realization of the dream of "world power." Napoleon after Austerlitz, even after Wagram, was not more nearly a world ruler than would William II be, so the Allied capitals believe, if peace came now on any conceivable terms. That is why peace is a forbidden subject in all Allied circles.



It is natural to sum up at the end of the first year of the war, which was reached on the first of August, the progress made by the combatants, the cost in men and material resources, and the conditions and prospects of this great struggle. England has done much in her control of the sea; not nearly so much on land; not so much as might have been expected of her. France has fought nobly and well, but has not been able, even with outside assistance, to drive out the intruders. Belgium is under the control of Germany. The Russians notwithstanding earlier successes have been driven far back. Germany has not done near all she hoped and planned, but has after all, in the circumstances, achieved remarkable success. Her preparedness is a warning to the world in different senses. Austria seems now practically a part of Germany. The Austrians are fighting more successfully than they did. Turkey, joining the Germanic forces, has proven a foe not to be despised by the Allies. The Dardanelles, notwithstanding great effort and expenditure of means, remain closed against the

Allied fleet and armies. The submarine policy of Germany has not been a success from a military point of view. Aviation has proven of great benefit to both sides. The deciding hour of the war has not arrived. The fate of nations, and of the world in a degree, is yet hanging in the balance. We quote again from Mr. Simonds in the Review of Reviews as he sums up the twelve months of world war:

In this period not less than 10,000,000 men have been killed, wounded, or have gone into foreign prisons; a territory exceeding in area Ohio or Pennsylvania has been ravaged. Cities known through the centuries as the treasure-houses of art, or in the last century become the centers of modern industrial life, have been destroyed. Written history has no record to compare with the tale of recent months of suffering, slaughter, destruction, human misery, and human grandeur. But what now is the result?

The simplest answer to make to this question is to take the premise that peace would come to-morrow on the basis of things as they are. Such a settlement it is instantly apparent would mean that Germany, helped rather by her use of the resources of her two allies than by any capacity of theirs, has won more European territory than any state has acquired by a single war since the Treaty of Westphalia, a more complete victory than any people since the Napoleonic episode. To-day her armies occupy practically all of Belgium and 8000 square miles in France, that region which before the war was the center of French industry and French mineral production. In the East victorious forces have pushed deep into Poland and approached Warsaw, Riga, and Brest-Litowsk.

On the field of battle Germany has won mighty and memorable triumphs. Her defeats have been repulses, when her foe was in his last ditch. They have resulted in the interruption of an advance, the recoil from the extreme

point of progress. But at the close of a year German armies are fighting on French, Belgian, Russian soil; only in a tiny corner of Alsace has the foe retained a foothold in the Fatherland.

Only on the water has she suffered real defeat. There her few free ships have been sunk; her commercial fleets have been scattered, sent to prize-courts, or interned. Beyond the seas Kiaochau, Southwest Africa, Togoland, Kamerun, and Samoa have been conquered. Sea-power has dealt with her as with Napoleon. But as Napoleon conquered the Continent, Germany has successfully defeated Russia, France, Great Britain, Belgium. The victory for the first year is then hers. Such difference of opinion as exists must be over the extent of the victory, which, however great, is nowhere yet decisive.



In this same connection it will be interesting to observe other opinions as to present conditions in this greatest war of the world's history. The Literary Digest in "summing up a year of slaughter" presents a careful and comprehensive review of newspaper judgment on the general war situation. The Detroit Free Press says "there has been a year of the most desperate and costly campaigning in the history of the human race, and the net result is practically a stalemate;" and the same paper thus balances the present situation and prospects:

The optimistic view from the German standpoint has for its excuse a demonstrated ability to prevent invasion and to live successfully on resources developed within the two Empires; a pessimistic view arises from realization of an apparent inability to break through the encircling cordon. From the standpoint of the Allies, optimism considers the manner in which the Germans have been isolated;

pessimism speaks of the powerlessness of the Entente armies to make any material advance.

The New York Evening Sun says that the two great objectives of Germany were to nullify France as an active foe, and failing that, to nullify Russia. "Both of these attempts having collapsed, where is the military success? The temporary advantage of fighting in the enemy's country has been purchased at a cost so great in men and resources—yes, and in shattered hopes—that it can only be regarded by the cool outsider as catastrophe." The New York Times concludes that the Germans have won much, but evidently regards them as having lost more; and says that these material losses could be made good, but Germany's moral loss is incomparably greater. The Springfield Republican does not care to predict the outcome of the war, but thinks that so long as all the Allied armies are intact, so long as all the nations of the Entente hold together and are willing to endure the loss and suffering of the war, they have a chance to win. The New York Evening Post says the most important question is whether modern warfare is any longer possible from the point of view of finance. Thus the question whether Germany may yet be beaten is now largely one of financial resources. There seems to be general agreement that a year more of the struggle will bring some of the nations to the verge of bankruptcy, if not actually pushing some nations over the line.

There are different lists of losses of men, and perhaps all are more or less of the nature of estimates. One of these, quoted by the Digest from the Independent, would make the total for Russia 3,600,000; France 1,560,000;

with a total for all of the Allies of 6,160,000. On the other side the figures are: Germany, 1,650,000; Austria-Hungary, 1,355,000; and Turkey, 200,000; or a total of 3,205,000 for the Teutonic allies. The grand total for both sides would be 9,365,000. The cost of the war in money is thus discussed by the New York Tribune:

Great Britain is now spending about \$15,000,000 a day on the war, according to Premier Asquith. Albert Metin, general budget reporter of the French Chamber of Deputies, calculates the war is costing France \$10,000 a minute, or \$14,400,000 a day. William Michaelis recently estimated the daily cost to Germany at \$8,250,000, saying forty days of this war cost as much as the whole Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. . . . Mr. Michaelis puts the total cost of the first year of the war at \$15,000,000,000, not including Italy's expenditures, a sum more than 50 per cent. greater than the gold-production of the world during the last 500 years. Other estimates run still higher, to \$20,000,000,000 or more.



The assistance which the secular press is furnishing in the campaign against the liquor traffic is invaluable,

and is somewhat different from that furnished by the religious press. The secular editor does not regard the

problem from exactly the same points of view, and he also reaches a wider and more varied class of readers. Some men will get his facts and arguments against the saloon who would never be reached by the editor of a religious journal. More and more also is the secular press lining up against the saloon interests. It is cheering to observe the telling blows that are con-

stantly being dealt the traffic by Collier's weekly. Not long since an editorial item called attention to newspaper headlines which asserted that the demon rum laughs at the water wagon, and that despite the nationwide prohibition movement, the whisky trust shows growing profits. The text of the article following such headlines, remarks the editor, reveals the financial marvels of the Distillers' Securities Corporation, and the facts are that the marvels do not justify the headlines. The annual report of the concern states that in the last three years, on a capital stock of over thirty millions the total net profit earned was less than two and a half millions, or a shade under 2.7 per cent per annum. Thus the demon is laughing on the wrong side of his mouth. Over half the total profit noted above was made during the past year, in which time this great corporation, through a subsidiary, has been furnishing enormous quantities of denatured alcohol to England and France for war purposes. The profits of this whisky corporation have not been so marvellous after all. On the same page as the article to which we have just referred appears another, under the heading, "Has your State done this yet?" It is as follows:

Why is it? If a president issues an order forbidding the use of liquor by his corporation's employees, that railway forthwith rises in public esteem and confidence. But when the Governor of a State sends out a similar warning to three thousand public servants, half of the nation snickers. Tell us why the State of Kansas has forbidden its "help" to use liquor. It is the first State to do so and won't be the last. For more than thirty years Kansas has had prohibition, and it knows that prohibition pays. Governor Capper sagely remarks that the wonder is that a ban on boozing by State employees

has not been applied before. One reason that occurs to us is that few boozers hold office in Kansas anyway. The "tank" is still a hero in some lands but hasn't been honored in Kansas for several decades. The jokesmiths are entitled to claim first laugh at each new piece of "Kansas lunacy," but Kansas usually laughs last and heartiest.



Reference has already been made on several occasions in this department to the temperance situation in Russia.

Russia's Temperance Struggle

One recent article recognized and discussed the difficulties that have arisen naturally in the working out of such a tremendous social problem. It is interesting to notice in this connection an instructive article on Russia's prohibition efforts in the Saturday Evening Post by Mr. Samuel G. Blythe, who writes rather from the view-point of the investigator and reporter than from that of the reformer. In the course of his article he speaks of the prevalence of prohibition, the origin of it, the results to the people, the difficulties in the way of securing strong drink, and of the efforts and devices employed to obtain it.

He states that there is no open sale and very little open consumption. During all the time he was in Russia he saw but one drunken man, who was making unsteady progress on the street in Moscow, and at whom the people stared as though he were a freak. Yet the writer remarks that less than a year previous drunken men were about as numerous in Russia as sober men. When vodka was on sale the average savings-bank deposits in Russia was in the neighborhood of from sixteen to twenty million dollars a year. In the one month of January

this year, five months after the sale of vodka had been prohibited, the former vodka drinkers put thirty million dollars into the savings banks of the Empire; that is, they saved nearly twice as much in one month as they formerly saved in a year. Again he states that the present fact, after almost a year of no vodka, is that Russia is regenerated. Crime has much decreased. Savings have much increased. Prosperity exists in many places where bitter poverty and debauchery existed before; and in spite of the tax of the war, its heavy drain on the manhood of the country and its enormous expense, Russia at war is a far stronger Russia, a far more prosperous Russia, a far more livable Russia, a far more civilized Russia, than before the war began and before the prohibition of vodka.

Mr. Blythe's article is not only readable and interesting, but also instructive and encouraging. It is not easy however to secure from any one a full and accurate summary of the progress and failure thus far of this great movement in Russia. The time also during which prohibition has been in force is entirely too brief for the proper development and testing of such a reform; but every lover of humanity and of the kingdom of God will watch with prayerful interest this struggle of one of the greatest nations of the world against the curse of strong drink. We quote still further from Mr. Blythe, and in his own words:

One touch of prohibition makes the whole world of drinkers kin! They use the same tactics for getting a drink in Russia that are used in any dry State in America, adopt the same subterfuges, try the same expedients and evasions, drink the same substitutes, go to the same lengths, and whip the

Demon Rum round the stump of thirst in the same old familiar way.

First and foremost, let me say that Russia is dry, arid, parched, anhydrous as far as liquor, and especially vodka, is concerned—that is, almost! Any earnest drinker who is earnest enough and has the price or the pull, can get a drink in Russia, or a lot of drinks—just as any earnest drinker in the United States can get a drink in any portion thereof, no matter how tightly closed the bars may be; but the process is not easy, and it is sneaky, and it is expensive. However, for a person from the United States who has ever felt the need of a stimulant in Topeka, say, or in Philadelphia on a Sunday, or in any other dry territory, the situation presents no new difficulties. Liquor is there. It can be obtained.

It can be done in Moscow with much less effort and intrigue, and it can be done in every other Russian city; but there is not a place where it can be done except on the sneak—not openly. And as for vodka—that pale white excitant which tastes like hair oil and burns like carbolic acid—vodka is about eliminated. I assume that a Russian with an uncontrollable thirst for vodka can fill himself to the ears with it if he goes at the job in a thorough manner; but no Russian can hurl it into himself while he is eating pickled fish at the Sakuska counter, as in the old days, and every vodka shop is closed—locked, sealed and closed—locked and sealed for good and all.

It is quite within the possibilities that when this war is over the Russians will

allow the sale of wine and beer. I do not say this will be done, but most of the Russian statesmen I talked with about it held to the idea that this was probable after the war. Not one of them intimated, even, that there ever would be a return to vodka, or to its manufacture or sale. They did not know about beer and wine, but they were certain about vodka.

Moscow has about two million people and is far more Russian than Petrograd. The Russians call Moscow "the heart of Russia;" so vodka figures from that city may be considered really Russian. Vodka was prohibited when mobilization began—about August first, or a few days before. In August, 1913, 667,296 gallons of vodka were sold in Moscow, and in August, 1914, after mobilization, 23,373 gallons. In September, 1913, Moscow drinkers of vodka consumed 759,947 gallons, and in September, 1914, they got along with 7314 gallons. In October, 1913, they drank 707,688 gallons, and in October, 1914—the third month of prohibition—they drank only 2913 gallons. The amount is far less now, because vodka was sold by the drink in the restaurants in Moscow during those three months; but the bottle shops, which were the plain-people emporiums, were closed. I am told that the Moscow proportion is fairly a criterion. Of course in some places in the Caucasus, and in the Far-Eastern points, there is still some consumption; but, as a whole, the Russians are not taking vodka. The nation has sobered up.

The Youth's Companion remarks: "Already we begin to get a glimpse of what the conditions will be in Europe after the war. **Vorwaerts** of Berlin figures that the entire income of Germany before the war will be only a

little more than enough to pay pensions and the interest on the national debt. All the ordinary costs of government—and they will be greatly increased, of course—will have to be raised by new taxation."



Editorials

THE AMERICAN PRINCIPLE OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

On no question touching the character of the government of the United States is there greater diversity of opinion than on the question, "What is the true American principle concerning religious liberty?" On certain of the most plain and simple facts involved there is of course substantial agreement. For example it is agreed that all men have an indefeasible right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. Provisions to this effect are found in our various State constitutions. It is agreed also that all men are at liberty to do as they please about making a profession of religion. Church membership is not now as it once was in at least some of the Colonies a prerequisite for the exercise of the right to vote. It is also agreed that the civil government has no right to use compulsion with respect to the matter of church attendance. Furthermore it is generally held that the civil government may not tax any one for the purpose of raising funds to erect or maintain houses of worship.

But when we pass beyond these and similar applications of the principle of religious liberty we enter a region where the path is not so plain and where opinions differ as to which is the right path. It has been decreed by the highest court in the land that no one may claim the right to practice immorality in the name of religious liberty. Polygamy may therefore be suppressed without violating that principle although Latter Day Saints hold that a plurality of wives is in

harmony with the will of God. It has also been decreed by many State courts that the offering of prayer in public buildings, such as halls of legislation, does not constitute such buildings houses of worship and that this custom is not a violation of the American principle. Moreover, it is the custom of the United States Congress to have the daily sessions of each House opened with prayer by chaplains chosen for that purpose. Congress does not regard the custom as a violation of the principle. In many of our States provision is made for the appointment and payment of chaplains for State penitentiaries and reformatory institutions, and there are not many who regard this as an infraction of the principle of religious liberty. In many of these institutions a copy of the Bible is furnished each inmate at the expense of the State, and no voice of protest is raised against the law which provides for it. It would seem to follow from all these facts that the principle is not violated when the Bible is read and prayers are offered in our public schools. Nevertheless objection has been made to the custom on this very ground. In some of our States the matter has been brought before the courts, and in most instances these courts have held that the principle of religious liberty is not violated. In very rare instances, as in Illinois, the contrary has been held on the ground that the Bible is a sectarian book. Evidently the judges who rendered this decision have not thought the matter through with that poise of judgment by which men on the bench should be

characterized. They probably did not take note of the fact that the law of Illinois provides for the furnishing of each inmate of the penal institutions of the State with a copy of the Bible. They seem not to have considered that since the Bible is the Word of God and is at least tacitly recognized as such by the law just mentioned, their decision makes God to be a sectarian God. The Illinois judges who are responsible for this decision are professing Christians.

The length to which that noisy class of citizens known as secularists have gone in pushing their theory of religious liberty raises the question whether opponents of religion may rightly insist on the exclusion of all religious forms, customs and usages from our public life. They are boldly making this demand and seem to be making progress in some quarters in getting their demand attended to. If we are to maintain the Christian character of our country we must stand together in a persistent effort to oppose them. To do this effectually it is necessary either to silence the guns of the enemy or to render their fire harmless. In our judgment while we cannot stop the persistent efforts of secularists to eliminate all Christian features from our public life we can show that their opposition should not be heeded by those entrusted with the management of public affairs.

There are two fundamental errors of which these secularists are guilty. The first is in reality a dangerous political heresy. It maintains that the true American principle of religious liberty means the entire separation of all religion from the state. The advocates of this heresy quote Thomas Jefferson who held that all religion is

a matter between the individual and God. But Jefferson was only partly right. Personal religion is a matter between the individual and God with which civil government may not interfere. But there is national religion which is a matter between the nation and God. Its fundamental doctrines are, God is the author of national life and the source of political authority; Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations and they are bound to submit to His rule; the revealed will of God is supreme law for nations and governments and they should harmonize their laws and conduct with its principles.

Secularists also quote the First Amendment to the National Constitution which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." But this amendment was designed to forbid a union of Church and State, and has no reference to the Christian customs, usages and laws which have ever been a feature of our American political life. Judge Story in his Commentaries on the Constitution makes this clear. All profound and sound thinkers, such as Francis Lieber, take this view of it. Moreover, the Supreme Court of the United States has settled the question in its famous decision in the Trinity Church case, in which the essential connection between the nation and religion is fully presented. If we cannot silence this battery of the enemy it surely should not be allowed to do harm to our historic institutions.

The second error of which secularists are guilty amounts in reality to a slander. It persistently misrepresents the purpose of those of us who are striving for national reformation on the basis of the true American principle

as above set forth. Seventh Day Adventists are the most persistent in making these misrepresentations. A recent issue of the publication which falsely calls itself "Liberty" contains a typical article of this class. The writer declares that "If the government should, through its law-making branch, act regarding the Sabbath, it would be legislation concerning a religious establishment. That would be opposed to the national Constitution." "The Sabbath, whether regarded as occurring on the seventh or the first day, is altogether an establishment of religion." Referring to the Christian Statesman and those who support its policy this writer says, "we do most emphatically say that their intentions are, knowingly or unknowingly, in direct opposition to the American principle of religious liberty as guaranteed by the general government."

Since it has already been shown that the American theory of religious liberty does not call for the elimination of all religious ideas and practices from our public life, it follows that this writer is wholly in the wrong in his charge against the Christian Statesman. The policy of this paper is directly in harmony with the fundamental principle which has ever characterized the life of the nation that the American principle of religious liberty does not require the elimination from our national life of those laws, customs and practices which grow out of the principles of national religion, but does require that our government, laws and usages should be brought into harmony with those principles.

Of course all intelligent readers will see the absurdity of the statement in the quotation given above that "the Sabbath is an establishment of re-

ligion." The statement is so supremely absurd that it needs no refutation. It is enough merely to call attention to it. But it affords occasion for stating what the Sabbath really is. It is essentially an institution. Just now it matters not how when or where it originated, although we hold that it is divine, and that by divine, not Roman Catholic authority, it has been fixed on the first day of the week. The Sabbath moreover is a civil as well as an ecclesiastical institution. It enters into civil life to the extent of stopping the wheels of commerce and of civil government. There can be no ecclesiastical Sabbath unless there is a civil Sabbath. No one can keep the Sabbath ecclesiastically if he does not keep it civilly. It is throwing dust in people's eyes to say that it is a religious institution. It certainly is a religious institution, but that does not mean that it is wholly a church institution. Just because it is religious, and because civil government stops its machinery on the rest day there is a necessary and inseparable connection between civil government and religion. Does the American principle of religious liberty call for the abolition of all Sabbath laws? Would not such an act prove to be a most flagrant violation of that principle? Laboring men can have no Sabbath unless it is secured by law. Whenever any one's theory of liberty leads to the invasion of the liberty of others it is surely fallacious. Whenever it invades the right of the nation itself it is doubly fallacious. Opposition to Sabbath laws does invade those rights. But when it would uproot the fundamental principle of government that nations sustain relations to God and his law it is treason.

GERMANIZING AMERICA

At a recent meeting of German-American societies held in San Francisco action was taken with a view to perpetuating certain German customs in this country. This is in line with what has been going on for some years in many sections, notably in our cities in which there is a large German population. A similar line of activity has been noticed with reference to other nationalities, but the Germans are the most outspoken and determined in such efforts. It is time that all true Americans, whatever their nationality, should become aroused to the danger that lurks in all such schemes. There should be a readiness on the part of all to give Germany credit for whatever she has done that is of real benefit to mankind. But a loud protest should be raised against every effort to Germanize America.

It is a mistake to credit Germany with bringing to the fore all that tends to advance the well-being of the human race. The truth is that the best this country has did not originate in Germany at all. The world has had too much of the German theory of civil government as that theory is exemplified today. It is true that the great German writers on civil government during the generation that closed about the time the present emperor was crowned were sound in their main contentions as to the origin and character of civil government. We still study their writings with profit. But the writers who have swayed German opinion and outlined German policy for forty years teach an entirely different system. The theory that might makes right seems to lie at the base of the whole German political policy of

the present. Such a theory demands a mighty army which is the embodiment of the theory. This results in making every citizen a soldier. But the soldier is only a part of a great machine. He loses his individuality almost completely. This is in harmony with the monarchical theory of government culminating in the clothing of the monarch with the divine right to reign. Such a system has nothing to teach America except that we should abjure it in its entirety. One of the heresies which America had to contend against in the formation period of this Republic was the heresy of the divine right of kings. The patriots who gave character to American institutions learned their political philosophy from the Puritans, the Pilgrim Fathers, the Covenanters and the Bible. England afterwards learned the same political principles and was delivered from the shackles of the tyranny it always engenders, but Germany with all her boasted intelligence is still controlled by the old tyrannical theory. May the war now raging forever break this yoke.

Germany has already done this country great damage by the inculcation of an erroneous theory of the Sabbath. Two theories widely separated in their essential elements and in their effects have been held with reference to the Sabbath in this Christian dispensation. Both agree in the recognition of the first day of the week as the proper day to be observed as the day of cessation from secular toil. The one however regards the Fourth Commandment as permanently binding and holds that the Lord's day is truly the Sabbath, and has been made so by divine authority. The other holds that the Fourth Commandment is not

new binding and that the Lord's Day is in no sense the Sabbath but is only a sort of religious holiday appointed by human authority alone in memory of our Lord's resurrection. Germany and other continental European nations have accepted the second of these theories. The result has been disastrous. It makes havoc of pure religion. The first of these theories was accepted by Britain and America. It has been productive of untold good to both. But the continental idea has made terrible inroads in this country. If its progress is not checked it will result in the destruction of American liberty.

The plan of these German-Americans if carried out will prove to be destructive of our national unity. A nation divided against itself cannot stand. This country has been called the melting-pot for all nationalities. By the powerful influence of our public school system and other agencies it has been fondly hoped that foreigners of all races, religions and tongues could be melted and fused together in one compact, homogeneous body. The process is difficult but not impossible. But it will require the co-operation of leaders of thought of all these different peoples. Whenever a considerable body of citizens of foreign birth refuse to be fused, whenever they decide to maintain their national distinctions and customs, the process cannot be carried on in so far as they are concerned. The result inevitably is national discord and national weakness. Such citizens prove a handicap rather than a source of strength.

There are three things to be considered when discussing the process of melting and fusing vast bodies of people of different nationalities into one compact national body. These are

race, language and religion. The time was when tribes of barbarous or half civilized people held that unity of race was essential to the integrity of the tribe. The term nation comes from a Latin root which means to be born. This does not mean that the nation itself is born but that those who may claim citizenship in the nation are all of the same birth or origin. But nationality today is something broader than this. The problem that confronts us is the combination of men of every race and nation in one nation. Language and religion are the two things that need to be specially considered. There is no fault to be found with the proposal to teach in our public school the chief languages of the world, such as the German, the French, and some others, but if it is proposed that the children of these different nationalities are to learn the language of their parents to the exclusion of English the proposal should be rejected. The learning and the speaking of English in our public schools should be made compulsory, no matter what is decreed by societies of hyphenated American citizens.

But the most important matter of all is the matter of national religion. This has nothing to do directly with the faith and manner of worship of individual citizens. In so far as the theory of Thomas Jefferson that government has nothing to do with religion relates to the religion of individuals he was right. But Jefferson and the great body of men since his day have seemingly overlooked the fact that there is such a thing as national religion. Its principles have helped to make this nation what it is. They have determined our form of government, although they have never been adequately embodied

in our governmental system. They are often vaguely and inadequately stated in public documents, laws and judicial decisions. They are taught in a measure in schools and colleges. They are proclaimed in a few Christian pulpits. They are advocated by the National Reform Association. They are for substance contained in the statement that God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, that Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations, and that the divine will is supreme law in the political realm. We have no hope of seeing the vast hordes of foreigners who come to America fused into one compact national body unless these principles of national religion are inculcated in our public schools. But many of these foreigners are hostile to this plan. They are largely responsible for the exclusion of the Bible from many of our public schools. What is to become of America with such a vast foreign population if the unifying influence of the Bible with its principles of national religion cannot be utilized is a problem that may well cause consternation. Is it too much to say that all these proposals that interfere with the unifying of the population of America are of a treasonable nature?



TRAFFIC IN MUNITIONS OF WAR

There is almost constant discussion of the question whether manufacturers of munitions of war in the United States should sell their products to the nations engaged in war. Two entirely opposite opinions are advanced by Christian moralists. On the one hand it is contended that since war is always wrong the whole business of the production of munitions of war is wrong

and that the government should prevent the sale and exportation of such material. It is contended on the other hand that there is justifiable warfare and therefore justifiable traffic in the munitions of war.

The Rev. Charles F. Aked and Professor Walter Rauschenbusch recently joined in a protest against the exportation of war material which was published in the Baptist Standard. Secretary of State Lansing recently gave out our government's reply to the Austro-Hungarian note protesting against the sale of arms and ammunition to England and her allies. The substance of these two documents has been admirably summarized as follows. The argument against the sale of munitions to the allies declares that "it makes our country a workshop of death; it is for profit, not patriotism; it compromises us in the eyes of humanity; it makes us an ally of the allies; it fosters an industry which will tend to militarism in the United States; theoretically it enables a small state to buy arms when attacked, but practically this is of little value, as the small state is likely to be completely invested by its greater and more warlike antagonist."

The points made by Secretary Lansing in justification of the exportation of arms and ammunition are these: "It is the accepted rule of international law, which no nation should break; it is and has been the universal practice of nations, Germany and Austria included; it is unneutral; it enables the United States to keep a small military establishment in time of peace; it enables all nations to get along without storing up vast reservoirs of military supplies; it tends to the peaceful method of settling military disputes."

It is difficult for some minds to understand how any one can be opposed to war as a matter of principle and yet be in favor of the position taken by Secretary Lansing. To arrive at anything like a clear and logically consistent position it is necessary to remember that there are two questions involved. The first is a question of pure morality. Is it ever right to go to war and is it ever right to produce the munitions of war? The other question is, since war material can be furnished at the present time to England and her allies only, is it not a violation of the principle of neutrality to do so? Let us try to settle the moral question first.

It does not follow that because war is always wrong that it is always wrong to fight. A war may be wrong on both sides. It is always wrong on one side. It may be right on one side. The case of the individual will illustrate the point in a measure. Burglary and assault with intent to hurt or kill are wrong. But it is not wrong for one to protect his property and his person against an assailant. That is, unless we take an extreme and unwarranted view of the words of Christ about turning the other cheek. No common sense exegete would think of applying those words to the case here presented. If a villain attacks your wife you would be unfit to have a wife if you did not use force for her protection. It is only because of a settled order of society with a strong police force that we do not need to carry weapons for self protection. It is because of the existence of civil government that our Lord discountenances the individualistic method of maintaining our rights.

This line of thought leads up to the main position that should be maintained in this controversy and which is

often overlooked. Civil government is not founded in force, but it needs and must use force. It not only has the right to have its force well organized but it is shamefully derelict in duty if it does not. From the policeman up to the army and the navy government makes a display of force. In the Scriptures this force is typified by the sword. This is the figure used by Paul in his famous exposition of the origin, nature and functions of civil government in the thirteenth chapter of Romans. This sword is placed in the hands of the government by God Himself. It would be a glorious thing if we needed no policemen to keep order in our streets and to protect our homes. But since there is a criminal class it will not do for us to proceed on the theory that there is none. So long as this class exists civil government must use force to keep it in subjection.

But there are criminal nations as well as criminal individuals. Christianity has not proceeded as far in lifting up nations and governments as it has individuals. When the rights of a nation are invaded to the extent of robbing it of its territory and destroying its autonomy should it tamely submit? A good deal of the theorizing of the day on the part of those who object wholly to armies and navies proceeds on the mistaken notion that the nation that has no army and navy will never be attacked and that the existence of an armed force is calculated to provoke war. While there is something in the contention the conclusions drawn from it are too extreme. China today is an example of the dread consequences of unpreparedness. She is losing her autonomy just because she is not prepared to fight.

If we go to the sacred Scriptures for evidence concerning the question of war we find ample proof for the position here taken. It is true that the Saviour of the world is called the Prince of peace. It is declared that the advancement of His kingdom will result in universal peace. When the nations of the world submit to His sceptre and frame their governments in harmony with His will they will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks and learn war no more. But all this is to be realized in the future. In the meantime it is plainly declared that there will be war. Nation shall rise up against nation and kingdom against kingdom. It is also plainly taught that while war is nearly always wrong, there is often such a thing as justifiable warfare. It was right for Abraham to engage his men in war with the kings that had smitten the armies of Sodom and Gomorrah and carried away Lot and his household. It was right for Abraham to have his trained band of soldiers. Safety demanded it. The wars of Israel against the seven nations of Canaan were right since the Lord so decreed. Those nations had committed unpardonable national sins and were doomed to destruction. Had they not been overthrown by the armies of Israel they would have perished on account of the character of their iniquities. The wars of the United States, first to gain our independence, and second to preserve the Republic intact, were justifiable. Our war with Spain in behalf of Cuba was a justifiable war, since it was undertaken, not for selfish reasons, but in behalf of an oppressed people.

We are opposed to war on principle. We hope and pray for the time

when there shall be no more war. We advocate the principles of national righteousness on the basis of which international and permanent peace can be established. We urge these principles upon all nations. But our government cannot yet adopt a policy which fails to recognize the fact that nations have not yet accepted these principles. How far such a government as that of the United States should go in keeping up an army and a navy is another question. But the discontinuance of all such preparedness can be done with safety only when there is an agreement of the great powers so to do. And that end will be reached only when the principles of national righteousness are accepted.

It is in place now to say a word on the second question involved in the discussion about the manufacture and sale of munitions of war to the allies. That question, as above stated, is that since such sales can be made only to England and her allies it is a violation of the principle of neutrality. It is to be remembered that these sales are not made by the government itself. Therefore the government is not directly charged with the violation of the principle of neutrality. But it is held that the government should prohibit such sales on the part of the manufacturers. It is sometimes difficult to keep the matter here involved separated from the matter of helping the allies because we may believe they are engaged in a justifiable war. Privately we may hold that opinion and thus justify such sales. But that is not meeting the problem, since it would be in reality making us an ally of the allies. The real question is, since as a nation we do not say which side is right or whether either side is right,

but since we occupy a position of neutrality, should our government permit such sales? It is doubtless true as has often been said that the manufacturers of arms and ammunition would sell just as readily to Germany and her allies as to England and her allies. This it is contended settles the whole question. It shows that we are entirely neutral. The fact that Germany cannot avail herself of the opportunity to buy is not our fault and does not change the fact of neutrality.

It may seem to many that this disposes satisfactorily of the question. This is not our war and we should not make it ours by any act whereby our attitude of neutrality would be compromised. But does it dispose of it as satisfactorily as some people think? There is a moral aspect of the question that thrusts itself into prominence even here. These manufacturers of munitions of war cannot be indifferent to the question which side is right if either side is right. And if one side is right and the other side wrong can they conscientiously sell to the side that is wrong? Can they so far conduct their business apart from the moral law as to ignore the moral principle here involved? If these manufacturing firms are composed of conscientious men must they not discriminate against those that would use their products in an unholy cause? Can they then be entirely neutral?

Once more, it is the prerogative of government to suppress moral evil. If we as a people are convinced that one side is right and the other side wrong should not the government forbid the selling of munitions of war to the side that is wrong and encourage such sales to the side that is right? Thus we are brought around again to the ques-

tion of maintaining a position of neutrality. It seems that the only way to maintain such a position is to shut our eyes to the moral aspects of the war. But the same thing is true with respect to many other matters that concern civil government. It seems that the true solution of all such problems will be found only when nations and governments are lifted to a higher moral level where they will cease to be problems at all. Abolish war and this whole war problem will disappear. Abolish any one of the great public and national sins and the problem of the right attitude of citizens, parties and governments toward them is solved. The principles of national religion furnish the only true solution of each of these problems.

But in the meantime what is the proper attitude of the American people and the United States government? As individuals and reformers we cannot do otherwise than pass judgment on the belligerent nations and express ourselves on the moral problems involved. Manufacturers of arms and ammunition are free from the responsibility of settling the moral question involved in selling to both parties to the war, but if the way were open to sell to both we do not see how they could evade that responsibility. Nor is our government burdened with the responsibility of settling the moral issue here involved, though if circumstances were altered we do not see how it could be honestly evaded. Men and nations as moral beings cannot refrain from the forming of moral judgments on the issues involved. At the same time it is not our war and President Wilson and Secretary Lansing are to be commended for their wisdom in preserving practical neutrality.

Special Articles

A PLEA FOR JEREMIAH

Samuel Zane Batten, LL.D.

In all times and in all lands the person who warns and counsels men has not been very popular. It was so in Old Troy where Cassandra was regarded as a mad woman and scorned by all. It was so in old Jerusalem where Jeremiah became the standing joke of the boys on the streets. It is so in modern America where the man who takes a serious view of national affairs is written down as a pessimist or muckraker or socialist. At the risk of being set down as a Jeremiah or a pessimist or something worse, I believe the time has come for a most serious view of our national condition and a careful review of our national tendencies. Nay more, I am prepared to say that Jeremiah was one of the best men and truest patriots that ever lived. And I state my conviction that America just now needs some prophets of the Jeremiah type who see things as they are and refuse to blink at evil.

This man Jeremiah suffered much at the hands of men in his time, and he has suffered much at the hands of men since his day. It was his lot to live in one of the critical times of Israel's history when evil causes were producing their evil fruit and the nation was hurrying on to national disaster. It was his mission to go to his people with a message of warning and a threat of impending doom. He refused to be deceived by the glamour of false prosperity, but pierced beneath the surface of things to the underlying causes of decay. He refused to be silent when false promises were held out to the

people and declared that they were all counsels of death. He simply refused to ignore the tragic facts of life. He refused to blink at the growing sin of his people. Because he censured king and priest he was written down as a revolutionist and his life was threatened. Because he declared that resistance to Babylon was useless and advised his people against war he was treated as a traitor and was thrown into the dungeon to die. For his brave and faithful word he was drummed out of his native village of Anathoth. For his sorrowful countenance he was dubbed the weeping prophet and was made the butt of corner loafers.

Yet there never has been a better patriot, a braver soul, a truer prophet than this man Jeremiah. He lived in a sad time and he saw through the surface and show of things. King and priests were false to God and faithless to their pledges. The people were frivolous and pleasure loving, forgetting God and forgetful of their national calling. In the north and east the storm cloud was gathering and the armies of Babylon were sweeping all before them. It is only a question of time when the destroyer will be in the land and will knock at the gates of Jerusalem. Repent of your sins; trust ye in Jehovah; it may be that you shall be saved. "Your sins are your own doomsmen" cried the prophet; "you have forsaken the covenant of our God; you are digging the grave of the national hope." Then the storm of opposition long gathering broke upon the head of the devoted prophet. "He is a prophet of evil; he is no prophet of God," said some of the accredited

and honored prophets of the court. "Hush your whinings and complainings," they said to Jeremiah. "Be not disturbed; all is well with Judah," they counseled the people. "The destroyer is coming and Jerusalem shall become a heap of ashes" said Jeremiah. "You are an unbeliever," said the priest; "you are despising this sacred temple; the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord is this holy house; God will take care of us." "He is no patriot" said the people; "he is a pessimist and man hater." Alone, sad and sorrowful he walked the streets of Jerusalem and looked into the faces of the people. "There goes Jeremiah the pessimist; he is an alarmist and muck-raker; he is a little Israelite; we suspect that he is in the pay of the King of Babylon."

Then the prophet speaks and vindicates himself; These men who wear the prophet's mantle and prophesy smooth things; who cry Peace, Peace, and say that all is well, are false prophets, and blind guides. They are the unskilled physician who refuses to probe the wound and remove the deep-seated infection. They are simply poultice-makers and salve-dealers; they heal the hurt of the daughter of my people but slightly. This building was once a Temple of the Lord; but you have forsaken his covenant; this building without loyal people and true worshippers is only stone and mortar. "Oh, my people, how my heart yearns over you; I would gladly die if ye might live. Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!"

It is an old saying that history forever repeats itself. In our nation at this time there are causes at work that

spell disaster and jeopardize our nation's life. America at this hour needs a generation of true prophets, men who see right through the shows and shams of things, men of clear vision who see things as they are, men who declare unto America our sins and show unto us our iniquities. But,—we might as well face the facts,—such prophets in America would be quite as unpopular as was Jeremiah in old Jerusalem. If we were asked to name one of the most destructive American traits we would say that it is our inveterate frivolity and invincible cheerfulness. "We are the people; everything is all right with America; we are the very favorite of heaven; no harm can possibly come to us. All is well. Hush your warnings. Call in the sentinels. Let us feast and sing. Health all around." How glibly some people can talk about our manifest destiny and the glory of America! How happy they feel because they call themselves optimists and say they believe in the future of the Republic! And how lightly too some people can talk about the course of the world, the decadence of nations and the downfall of empires! How unconcerned they are in the presence of the things that have destroyed nations and are at work in their own nation! Such as these was not the prophet Jeremiah. Never was there a truer patriot; never was there a man who loved his people and believed more fully that they were a chosen people. And now the sins and evils of his people appalled and crushed him! How he yearned over his nation with a godly yearning!

Two hundred years ago Robert South preached several great sermons on "The Fatal Importance and Force of Words." It is unfortunate that these two words Optimist and Pessimist

should be so often misunderstood, and should be used to conceal thought. I am an optimist, says a little shallow brain who has never learned to think and does not see the relation between cause and effect. Much of our so-called optimism is simply shallow-mindedness. Some of it is simply the comfortable man's satisfaction with the world which has given him an easy berth. Some of the so-called optimists are little timid souls who are afraid to face the unpleasant facts of life; and so they shut their eyes and say that everything is going well. Some of our optimists are simply too lazy to think, and so they smile and look wise. Not a few of our optimists are interested self-seekers who find the present situation profitable to themselves and do not want the people disturbed by serious thoughts. Much of our so-called optimism is as shallow as it is foolish. I have a profound dislike for that cheap optimism which refuses to look at dark facts. The real pessimist is the man who refuses to know the worst about a situation. The real optimist is the man who knows the worst and yet believes in the better. The real optimist is the man like Jeremiah who can see the land overrun with armies, and yet can believe in the future and can redeem the field at Anathoth.

One of the great needs of our time is clear vision, the ability and the willingness to see things as they are without blinking and faltering. There are many things that blind men's eyes, that confuse their minds and cause them to err in judgment. It was so in old Israel, and it is so in modern America. In old Israel there were some men calling themselves patriots and prophets who tried to calm the fears of the peo-

ple and were ever singing sweet lullabies. We are God's chosen people; nothing can harm us; all is well with the nation. These men, says Jehovah, are false prophets who are misleading the people and are hastening the doom of Israel. There are other men, called pessimists and traitors by some, who showed Israel their sins and summoned the people unto repentance. These men were the true prophets of Jehovah, loving Israel and speaking for the Lord of Hosts. They were the real optimists and patriots too, though they were often ridiculed and opposed. The most dangerous men in old Israel were those men calling themselves optimists, who said that we are an elect nation and all things are going well with us. These were the false prophets, like the unfaithful physician, who covered up the wounds of the nation, and healed the hurt of the people but slightly. And the most dangerous men in America today are the men, calling themselves optimists and patriots, who say that all is going well with the Republic, and we have nothing to fear. These men, called in the Scriptures the false prophets, are lulling the conscience to sleep and are the real enemies of the nation. On the other hand the most useful men and women in our land are those called pessimists and muck-rakers who are showing us our sins and are declaring unto us our iniquities. The men and women who are setting up a standard against the gross and brutal Mammonism of to-day are the great benefactors of the nation. The men and women who are combatting the insidious and outrageous vices of strong drink and impurity are doing much to save the nation from ruin. The prophets and statesmen who are rebuking the cruel insolence of the

money power and are fighting for the rights of the people are the men whom history will delight to hold in highest honor. The most useful men in our land at this time are the men who are tearing the mask from our hypocrisy and are showing us our deadly sins.

But such men to-day are as unpopular as their forerunners in the prophet's office have ever been. Some of the most dangerous men in the land to-day are most popular, while some of the nation's truest prophets are regarded as disturbers of the peace and enemies of the nation. "Art thou he that troubleth Israel" fiercely said King Ahab to the prophet Elijah. But the prophet who saw things in their causes more truly located the blame. "I have not troubled Israel; but thou and thy father's house." The cause of the drought and distress in Israel was not the warnings of Elijah but the apostasy of the king. It is necessary that we should know who are the men that trouble the people and make revolutions. "The French Revolution," said William Ellery Channing, "is perpetually sounded in our ears as a warning against the lawlessness of the people. But whence came the Revolution? Who were the regicides? Who beheaded Louis the Sixteenth? You tell me the Jacobins; but history tells a different tale. I will show you the beheaders of Louis the Sixteenth. They were Louis the Fourteenth, and the Regent who followed him, and Louis the Fifteenth. These brought their descendant to the guillotine. We hear of the horrors of the Revolution; but in this as in other things we recollect the effect without thinking of the guiltier cause." (Channing's Works, P. 169). We are gravely told to-day that we must not discuss these social

wrongs that exist lest the people be made more discontented and rebellious; more than that we are earnestly charged to hush the clamors of the people and preach peace and quietness. Some time ago the editor of a religious weekly strongly objected to a declaration of social principles put forth by a representative body of men, on the ground that such declarations were calculated to arouse the people and make them more discontented.

We have heard all these objections and pleas before, and we say frankly that they are the pleas of false prophets and the objections of faithless physicians. In a remarkable letter Thomas Arnold throws some light on this question. "One good man who sent a letter to the Times recommends that the clergy should preach subordination and obedience. I seriously say God forbid they should; for if any earthly thing could ruin Christianity in England it would be this. If they read Isaiah and Jeremiah and Amos and Habakuk, they will find that the prophets in a similar state of society did not preach subordination only or chiefly, but they denounced oppression and amassing overgrown properties and grinding the laborers to the smallest possible pittance; and they denounced the Jewish high church party for countenancing all these iniquities and prophesying smooth things to please the aristocracy." (Arnold's Life and Letters, Vol. L. p. 254). In a like spirit we have a letter from Frederick Denison Maurice who writes to his friend Kingsley urging him to write "a working country parson's letter about the right and wrong use of the Bible—I mean protesting against the notion of turning it into a book for keeping the people in order." (Life

of Maurice, Vol. I. p. 463). The dangerous men in any land are the people who make light of social ills, refuse to probe the wound to the bottom and thereby remove the causes of social discontent. The true prophets of God are the men who see things as they are, who refuse to blink an unwelcome fact, who know that we never can have social peace till we have social justice and refuse to hold their peace till justice is done.

The people of America need to cultivate the clear vision and the serious mood. We need the courage to face some hard and trying problems and to work them through. We need to study history for a while and see what are the causes that have destroyed nations. We need to give greater diligence to make our calling and election sure. We need to put away our thoughtless optimism and face the solemn facts of the hour. The persistence and prevalence of this American spirit of superficial optimism is quite certain to deprive us of any great and long future. We need at this hour a generation of prophets and patriots of the Jeremiah type, men who believe in God, who love the people and see things as they are. Ringing the alarm bell at midnight is not a pleasant task. But when the city is on fire it may be necessary. Not to ring the bell under these circumstances lest some one be disturbed may be arson and murder. The alarm bell needs to be rung aloud in our land at this time, for the fate of the Republic is in the balance. It was Cassandra's misfortune to have her warnings unheeded in old Troy. But it was Troy's doom that her warnings went unheeded.

Philadelphia, Pa.

THE PROPHETIC FUNCTION OF THE MINISTER.*

By Prof. R. C. Wylie, D.D., LL.D.

There are evidences on almost every hand that proper conceptions of the gospel ministry are none too common. In truth erroneous conceptions prevail largely among the masses of the people, are exceedingly common in the ranks of the ministry, and are not unknown in theological seminaries. As a consequence there is lack of that high regard for the ministry which once prevailed, and there is failure on the part of some who have been inducted into this office to discharge its functions with fidelity. A lack of pulpit power inevitably follows, the ministry loses its prestige, and competent young men who might otherwise heed the call to preach turn aside to other occupations.

It may prove beneficial to both clergy and laity to turn our thoughts at this hour to the serious consideration of the ministerial calling. What we wish to say can be best presented under the title, "The Prophetic Function of the Gospel Ministry." Lest any should gain the impression that by prophetic function the prediction of future events is meant it may be necessary to state at the outset that we do not claim for the ministry any such function. A prophet is not so much a foreteller as a forteller. He is one who speaks for another. The prophet of God is one who speaks for God and delivers a message from God. That message may relate to the past, the present, or the future. It may consist in the announcement of a truth

*Address delivered at the opening of the Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa., Tuesday, September 21, 1915.

or a duty. It may partake of the nature of rebuke, warning, commendation, or promise. It will embody all that God is pleased to reveal about Himself and his plan and purpose concerning his creatures. It does not therefore originate with the man who delivers it. He does not discover it while engaged in scientific studies, although science may afford apt illustrations whereby it may be elucidated and enforced. It is not a philosophical opinion or speculation, although philosophy may be invoked to illuminate and support it. Neither is the message of the prophet composed of traditions handed down from the ancients. Such traditions often make void the word of God. Preaching is not the announcement of human opinions either ancient or modern. It is the proclamation of the word of the Lord.

That this was true of the prophets during the ages when the Scriptures were in process of formation is not open to question. It is abundantly shown by various forms of expression which abound in the prophetic books. Prophets prefaced their announcements with the formula, "Thus saith the Lord." They were enjoined to speak the word of the Lord faithfully.

While this is true of the prophets of the Bible is it true of the ministers of the New Testament dispensation? It is not claimed that the gospel ministry today obtains a message direct from God, either through dreams or visions or angelic agency or the direct voice of God. Nevertheless the message to be delivered is God's message and the minister is therefore a true prophet of God.

It is essential that we get a right conception of the gospel ministry. It

will be generally conceded that it is some kind of an office. It is not a mere calling or occupation like that of the merchant, the manufacturer, the lawyer or the physician. We speak properly of the office of the Christian ministry. What sort of an office is it? It may be assumed that all official functions are included under the three-fold division, kingly, priestly and prophetic. The office of the ministry must therefore fall under one of these three. While the people of God in general are called a kingly people and are destined to reign, this title does not belong in any peculiar sense to the ministry. While the body of Christ's people are called a kingdom of priests, ministers are never called priests in the New Testament by way of distinction. Special stress should be placed upon this fact because not only does the Roman Catholic Church regard the gospel minister as a priest but priestly functions are considered the highest and most important of all his public duties. High Roman Catholic officials declare that "No act is greater than the consecration of the Body of Christ." Cardinal Manning declares that "Priests offer the true Lamb and 'the Blood which speaketh better things than that of Abel'." It is also claimed that added to this is the power of absolution or the power to remit sin, and in these two functions the power of the priesthood is complete.

It should not be overlooked that in the Episcopal Church likewise the minister is known as a priest, and there is a constant drift toward Rome in the employment of so-called priestly functions.

But even this is not all. There is a tendency among many Protestants to regard the gospel minister as in some

peculiar sense a priest charged with important priestly functions. It is true that in the matter of intercessory prayer there is a quasi priestly function, and this function is to be discharged by the minister in his public ministrations, but he shares this function with all the people of God. It is trenching on dangerous ground to speak of the minister as sharing in Christ's priestly office in any sense in which all the people of God do not share it.

It is worthy of note that all the terms employed in the New Testament to designate the gospel ministry involve the idea of the prophetic, not the priestly function. This is made specially prominent in such terms as witness, ambassador, and others of similar import. From the earliest times it has been the belief of those who have adhered most closely to the New Testament teachings that preaching is the chief function of the minister and preaching is essentially prophetic.

Since the preacher is truly a prophet, and since the prophets of the Bible invariably received messages direct from God, why may not the prophets of the present receive messages in the same manner? Why may not the so-called revelations of the Seventh Day Adventist Prophetess, Mrs. White, the revelations of Mormon prophets and the new gospel of Mrs. Eddy be in reality the voice of God to this generation? Why should we insist that no new revelations are given? The answer is easy and conclusive. For thousands of years God was unfolding his plan of salvation and preparing the world for the climax of the unfolding process in the death of His Son on the cross. In the fullness of time Christ came and offered Himself an atoning sacrifice.

The record of the whole process and of the final act has been made. There is nothing more to do now in the way of working out the plan. It needs no amendment. It is complete. The record is also complete. All that is needed now is the application of the benefits of redemption, and that is done, not by new and repeated revelations, but by the convincing, regenerating, and sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit. It is safe to say that all supposed revelations since the sublime vision of John on the Isle of Patmos are frauds. The province of the minister as prophet is to unfold, explain, illustrate and seek to make effectual the plan of salvation as set forth in the Scriptures. For this work he needs illumination, unction, power, but not a new revelation. He gets his equipment by the constant study of the Word and by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. We may therefore adopt the words of Paul and say, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema."

By the facts already presented the question as to the proper ministerial attitude toward the Bible is indicated. Is it to be placed on a level with the sacred books of the non-Christian religions, such as the Avesta of the Zoroastrians, the Veda of the Hindus, the Koran of the Mohammedans, or does it belong in a class by itself? Is it the revelation of the purpose and plan of God concerning our fallen race, or is it composed of the opinions of men concerning the way by which men may return to God? Is it the record of the divine activities in seeking and saving a lost world, or is it the record of man's efforts to find God? Is it a

revelation given by divine interposition, or is it an account of a religious evolution? The answer lies just at hand. Unless the Bible is the Word of God we have no message worth delivering, and our fallen race is without God and without hope.

Biblical scholarship today presents two great problems with which we must grapple. The first relates to the composition of the Scriptures. Is there any ground for the theory that older documents were used in the composition of any of the books of the Old Testament? While it is possibly true that this was done in some cases and to a limited extent, the theory has been carried to a most ludicrous extreme. It is possible to hold to this theory in some degree and remain orthodox in our faith, but it is not possible to remain orthodox and accept all the so-called certainties of modern Biblical scholarship. The second great problem which grows out of the first relates to the reconstruction of the Bible on a new plan. The Bible as we have it shows the gradual unfolding of the plan of God for the salvation of the world. It is a revelation from heaven: a light shinning in a dark place until the day dawn and the Day-Star arise in our hearts. It is a shining light that shines more and more unto the perfect day. It places the full sacrificial ritual at the beginning of the Mosaic dispensation whereby the need of atonement by the shedding of blood is plainly taught, and the certainty of it in the fullness of time not indistinctly foreshadowed. But what does the destructive critic offer us? He holds that like other sacred books the Bible is only the record of man's experiences in feeling after God; that the idea of its being a

supernatural revelation must be abandoned; that the men who thought they were speaking in the name of the Lord were mistaken; that sacrifices were not of divine appointment, but only indicate a barbarous notion of the character of God and the conditions of salvation; that the sacrificial ritual was the fruit of a process of development and did not reach perfection till after the Babylonian captivity; that the whole Biblical history must be rearranged and rewritten.

Charity itself does not require us to admit that the destructive critic is a true prophet of God. He lacks all the requisites of a genuine prophet. As in the days of old there were false prophets, so we have been forewarned there shall be false prophets in these last days. The itching ears that demand constantly something new must not be allowed to determine the character of the gospel message. Originality has its place in the presentation of the gospel, but its place is not to invent a new gospel. Even Jesus Christ himself delivered no new gospel. We hear much of His originality as though he announced a plan of salvation that was wholly new. But this is all wrong. He announced the same old way that was made known to Adam before he was banished from paradise, and he backed it up by Old Testament proof texts. He announced no new moral law. He merely removed the false glosses placed on the law by the Rabbis. You may become a nine-days' wonder by departing from the orthodox path, you may flash across the religious heavens like a flaming meteor by announcing some sensational theory as to the person and work of Christ, but it is of such that the inspired penman

has written the verdict, "wondering stars to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." On the other hand "they that be wise" in the presentation of the Biblical message "shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever."

Having presented these fundamental facts concerning the gospel messenger and his message it is now in place to inquire for whom the message is intended. In a general way there is agreement on this matter. It is intended for the race of men. Without distinction as to nationality or language the gospel is for all. Not only so, but it is for all viewed as sinners.

But this raises certain questions in answering which there is not complete harmony. Sin has penetrated into all the ramifications of life. It has corrupted every form of human society. The inquiry is raised therefore as to the obligation resting upon the preacher to ferret out sin wherever it lurks, whether in the individual heart and life, or in the household, or in the market and the shop, or in the political body called the nation, or in civil government itself.

There is a theory quite prevalent among ministers as well as laymen that all sin is wholly personal or individual; that there is and can be no such thing as corporate or national sin; that if all the individuals of whom society is composed would confess and forsake their individual sins all so-called corporate sins would disappear. It is held therefore that the whole mission of the minister is discharged by dealing exclusively with individuals. It is said moreover in support of this view that while the Old Testament prophets

addressed their messages to society or to bodies of men the New Testament message, calling as it does for individual conversion and sanctification, is addressed exclusively to individuals. Ministers therefore according to this view have no call to be reformers. The salvation of individual souls is the one exclusive object of the preaching of the gospel. The reformation of society and of civil government will follow as a by-product.

But is this theory philosophically sound? Is it Scriptural?

Is it true that all sin is individual and personal and that there is no such thing as corporate or national sin? And is it so that the abandonment of sin by individuals disposes of all so-called corporate and national sin? As a matter of fact all the individuals of which corporate bodies are composed never do repent and reform merely as individuals. There never has been a general turning away from sin that has not been social. Moreover, sins are not all committed by individuals acting separately. Most sins are committed by men associated together. Sabbath breaking and intemperance for example are not purely individual sins, they are social and national. There are just two supposable methods whereby such sins can be removed. The first is by the individuals one by one renouncing the sins of which they have been guilty in connection with the corporate body and separating from it. The other is for the corporate body to renounce its corporate sins. While individuals by such renunciation and separation from the sinful body may free themselves from blame, such a process is impossible in the case of national bodies because only a small proportion of its

constituent members can ever be persuaded to adopt this method. The only way therefore whereby the removal of public sins can be fully achieved is by the process of reformation of the social body itself. One of the damaging errors of our times closely connected with this notion that all sin is individual and personal only is the theory that we can be associated with corporate bodies in the violation of moral law, repent as individuals and continue to sin in connection with such bodies.

Since men have social natures they sin in their social natures and only by social reformation can such sins be blotted out. This view is fully sustained by the Scriptures. Associations of men such as nations can do right and wrong and can receive the reward of their deeds. While it is true that the New Testament gives great prominence to the individual side of the work of salvation, the social side is not neglected. If the Old Testament prophets dwelt largely on the character and moral obligations of the nation, it only shows that this is one way of approach whereby the kingdom of God is promoted. It puts the society of the kingdom of God first and the individual second. The individual is reached through society. If the New Testament prophet deals largely and primarily with the individual it only shows that this is another way of approach whereby the kingdom of God is advanced. It puts the individual members of the kingdom first and thus prepares the material of which that kingdom is constituted.

It is deserving of our careful attention that all the successful ministers of the gospel, whether in the former or the latter dispensation have fearlessly

pointed out the sins of both individuals and society. That this was true of the Old Testament prophets is so evident that it is needless to spend time in proving it. No one can read the discourses of our Lord with understanding without being impressed with the thought that He did the same. The great preachers from that day to this have followed in His footsteps. Augustine, Chrysostom, Savonarola, Luther, Calvin, and the great cloud of witnesses produced by the Reformation, all were given to the practice of preaching against public as well as individual sins. And these men were all given to the practice of expository preaching. No one can faithfully expound the Scriptures and fail in this regard.

Since the minister of the gospel is the Lord's prophet with a message which God Himself has given to be delivered to sinful men and nations it follows that the announcement of it must be made in very positive terms. Recently a man of considerable ability in delivering a public address made the assertion, "There is no heresy but finality." If this be true it is never proper to maintain that we have reached final truth in anything. Is finality the only heresy, or is the assertion that it is a heresy itself a heresy? Is it proper for us to make positive assertions in the announcement of the gospel message or shall we always leave the impression that after all we may be wrong and that future generations may be able to correct our mistakes? If we are right in what we have said about the minister's proper attitude toward the Word of God there can be no doubt about the positive character of his message. Perhaps the plainest division of the System of

Christian Theology is that which presents it in three parts: first, the doctrine concerning God; second, the doctrine concerning man; third, the doctrine concerning Christ. Has the minister the right to assert anything positively in unfolding the theological system thus outlined? Is there anything of a final nature which we know about God? True no man can know the Almighty to perfection. But do we not know that He is? How can we know that He is without knowing something of His character? Does He not reveal His existence by revealing His attributes? "He that cometh unto God must believe that He is and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." Jesus Christ came into the world that He might make a fuller revelation of God than had previously been given. Did He tell us nothing of a final character? Did He not make known the nature of God? Did He not make it clear that God is love and that He so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son for our salvation?

Passing to the second chief division of the theological system, the doctrine concerning man, is there nothing final that can be announced from the pulpit? Paul certainly did some positive preaching on this topic. He declared that all men, both Jews and Gentiles, are guilty before God, and that they have come into this estate by a fall from a condition of holiness. He asserts with all positiveness that man is powerless to work out a saving righteousness of his own. Our Saviour was exceedingly positive on this matter. He declared that no man can come unto Him unless drawn by the Father. He asserted the absolute necessity of our being born again by the will and

power of God. Furthermore there are a number of things very positively asserted in the Scriptures falling under the third great division of systematic theology, which treats of the doctrine concerning Jesus Christ. He is declared to be the Son of God, to be God equal with the Father, to be the son of David, and therefore truly man, to have been begotten in the womb of the Virgin Mary by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit and therefore without a human father. He is declared to be the Saviour of the world, and to have accomplished our salvation by His death on the cross. His resurrection is one of the most plainly stated facts in all the Scriptures. It is declared to have been followed by His ascension and enthronement at the right hand of God. It is because of His merit that sinners are called, justified, sanctified, and finally glorified. It is positively asserted in the Scriptures that Jesus Christ is clothed with universal authority, all things both in heaven and on earth, and all things that can be named, both in the present age and in the age that is to come, being made subject to Him. It is also positively asserted in the Scriptures that this same Jesus who was crucified will some day be seen coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, and at the sound of the last trumpet all the dead shall be raised and shall stand before His judgment seat. If you cannot preach these things as positive truths and as finalities you are not called to be the Lord's prophets. There is no effective preaching that is not positive. Ministers of the word are called to announce finalities. All the great preachers of all the past ages announced the gospel message as a finality. You have no

call to reconstruct the gospel plan of salvation. We hear much today of salvation by character, or by a process of evolution. But this is nothing but another way of advocating salvation by works. Salvation is a free gift. We are chosen unto good works, not because of them. We are chosen, justified and sanctified that good character may be produced, not because we possess it already.

While it is necessary to be positive in preaching it is very essential to know where to lay the positive stress. If ever you have doubts about the divinity of Jesus Christ, or the necessity and efficiency of the atonement made by the blood of the cross go with Paul into retirement in Arabia until all such doubts are dissolved. If you question the reality of Christ's resurrection, ascension and enthronement and entertain doubts about the final and complete success of His plan for the conquest of the world go with John to the isle of Patmos and behold the glorified Lord walking in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, listen to the universal anthem of praise to Him that sits on the throne, watch the opening of the seals of the book that contains the record of the divine purpose, witness the marshalling of the hosts for the conflict for the mastery of this planet, hear the crash of the falling thrones of the princes of this world, and hearken to the heavenly voices proclaiming, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ."

The final word that should be spoken with reference to the prophetic function of the minister is that he is engaged in a mission with a definite and lofty aim. That aim is nothing else than the establishment of the

Kingdom of Jesus Christ. This is implied in all that has been said. Sin is nothing else than rebellion within the divine kingdom against the authority of the King. The Scriptures unfold the purpose and plan of God with reference to the putting down of this rebellion. The minister is commissioned to declare that word and to denounce sin in every form and in every place where it has its seat. There is not a theme that may properly be introduced into the pulpit that does not fall naturally under the great master theme the Kingdom of God and of Christ. To His scepter all kings and governments must submit. Those that refuse shall be broken in pieces like a potter's vessel. Near the close of John's vision he witnesses the fall of Babylon. In both the Old Testament and the New Babylon stands for organized iniquity. It represents the world's antagonism to righteousness. The fall of Babylon is the last event in the great conflict for the dominion of the world and this is followed by the formation of the proper relation between the nations and Christ, symbolized by the marriage feast. The land will then be married to the Lord.

The honor of bringing to pass this grand consummation is to all the saints. But there is a special honor which belongs to the ministry as leaders of the hosts of the Lord.

Sometimes it seems that error is more powerful than truth and that at least some modification of the gospel message will prove more effective than will the complete Biblical system. More individuals can be won to the Christian faith if concessions are made to their individual opinions and worldly practices. Let it be granted that such appears to be the case, what then?

Have we not abundant proof that all such experiments leave a large part of gospel work undone? One of the constantly recurring inquiries is, Why has Christianity not conquered the world after almost two thousand years of effort? It has saved millions of souls but it has not saved the world. Individuals may be saved with part of the divine system provided they have the part that leads to genuine personal faith in a divine Saviour who offered Himself as a vicarious sacrifice for sin. But it takes the entire system of truth to save the world.

A most valuable list of practical truths may be learned from the great European war. It does not prove the failure of Christianity, but that Christianity has never been fully tried. It does not illustrate the collapse of Christian civilization, but the collapse of civilization without Christ. It does not prove the failure of Christian civil government, but that there are no Christian civil governments. Moreover it emphasizes the partial failure of the clergy to proclaim certain essential parts of the gospel. Its kingly aspects have been kept in the background. The moral obligations resting upon nations have been largely ignored. The Prince of peace who alone can give peace to the nations of the world has been heralded too exclusively as a Priest, seldom as the King. Kings and emperors have not taken Him into their councils and have adopted policies in conflict with His eternal principles of righteousness.

But even a worse sin than this has been committed. While the ministers of religion have failed to present essential parts of the gospel, having ignored the principles of national religion, they have claimed for the church the exclusive right to propagate the

kingdom of God on earth, forgetting that God's two witnesses are His representatives in ecclesiastical and political society. To complete this array of errors the climax is reached when that old Roman Catholic heresy is proclaimed that the Church alone is the kingdom of God. With such imperfect and even false conceptions of the ministry, the gospel message and the kingdom it is designed to establish, it would be a marvel if Christ's cause had made more progress than it has made. This trinity of errors is enough to cause the wheels of the chariot of salvation to drag heavily.

While prophets may expect to be stoned if they deliver their message with fidelity there is awaiting them a glorious reward. To His Apostles Jesus gave the promise, "Ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The prophet is rewarded by being made a king. "He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcame, and sat down with my Father in His throne."



MORAL CONDITIONS AT THE PANAMA EXPOSITION

Summary of Report by Federal Council of Churches.

It will be remembered that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, supported by all its constituent bodies and by local and state federations of churches, took measures long before the Exposition opened, to induce the authorities of the exposition and the city of San Fran-

cisco to maintain a high moral tone within and without the grounds.

Both the Exposition authorities and the Mayor of San Francisco insisted that it would be so and issued public statements to that effect.

In June the Council sent out a report from Dr. Thomas D. Eliot of the American Social Hygiene Association, showing that these promises had amounted to little or nothing.

The Council now issues a report from Bascom Johnson, Counsel of the Social Hygiene Association, who was sent to San Francisco for further investigation, which appears in full in the September issue of "Social Hygiene." It is far more serious than the previous one by Dr. Eliot.

Within the Exposition are several concessions, maintained despite protests specifically against them, which are deplorably vicious, portraying sexual indecencies, including even exhibitions of entire nudity. Known professional prostitutes are tolerated and certain conditions which were declared as being too bad to be allowed in the city itself, are permitted in these concessions.

In the city itself open prostitution is allowed and in one district Mr. Johnson says: "It is estimated that there are from 600 to 1,000 women on duty, the policemen being there apparently to prevent anything that would interfere with the orderly and profitable traffic in vice." These houses are open and

investigators report seeing 75 men and boys entering within ten minutes. They are among the "sights" of the city.

Cabarets in the center of the city are set up with every convenience for securing vicious women.

Summing up his report, Mr. Johnson says: "In spite of announcements of officials to the contrary, San Francisco remains one of the few large cities of this country where prostitution is frankly and openly tolerated. Here also little or no effective supervision and regulation of dance halls, rooming houses, cafes, and other public places where prostitutes ply their trade is provided. The natural and inevitable result has been that San Francisco has become the Mecca for the underworld, and that for every such addition to her population the problem is rendered that much more difficult."

Mr. Johnson tells also of the counteracting work of the Federal Council Committee of One Hundred, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the California Social Hygiene Association, the Young Men's Christian Association, and the Young Women's Christian Association, but intimates that, with little or no support from the Exposition and city officials, the tide of vice is too strong for them.

Among the reasons alleged are that the officials originally intended to keep faith, but that they have been influenced by financial necessities.

LISTEN well to the suggestion to speak to a friend or neighbor about subscribing to the Christian Statesman. You will be doing them a favor by bringing them in touch with our campaign for national righteousness through the medium of this magazine.

5000 new subscribers wanted before January first. Every one can help in this campaign by sending in one or more new subscribers. We ought to accomplish the mark before the date set.

The National Reform Movement

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST MORMONISM

A TYPICAL CASE OF MORMON POLYGAMY

**Showing the Perjuries and Perfidies of the High Priests and the
Sacrifice of Women and Children.**

Rumors which had been rife for some time concerning the new polygamous (meaning such "marriages" after the issuance of the inhibitive manifesto of the Mormon church in Utah in 1890) activities of David Eccles, a multi-millionaire of Utah, came to broad public attention in 1904, at the time that the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections was hearing the question of the right of Apostle Reed Smoot to a seat in the United States Senate.

Since that time the matter has had more or less agitation until the suit of Mrs. Margaret Geddes in behalf of her son, Albert, came to trial in Ogden, Utah, commencing in June, 1915.

Eccles had always denied publicly that he was the husband of Mrs. Geddes and the father of her son. He died in December, 1912, and on the last evening that he visited Mrs. Geddes. In fact Eccles fell on the sidewalk in Salt Lake City as he was hurrying to catch a train for his home in Ogden after having visited Mrs. Geddes.

The Ogden suit was entered by Mrs. Geddes in an effort to obtain for her son a share of the Eccles estate. The jury in the case gave a verdict that Albert Geddes was the son of David Eccles. Under this verdict the boy is entitled to share with the other heirs.

On June 22, 1915, during the hearing of the case at Ogden, Mrs. Geddes told dramatically of the efforts made by David Eccles to have her deny at the Smoot investigation (she having been subpoenaed and summoned to Washington as a witness) that he was the father of her child. "Tell them you do not know who is the father of your child," Mrs. Geddes testified at Ogden in June that David Eccles had instructed her.

She said she protested to Eccles that such a course on her part would brand her as a bad woman.

"Mr. Eccles told me," she said, "to have in mind Silas W. Eccles, and when they asked me if Mr. Eccles was the father of my child having this man in my mind, I could truthfully say no. He told me to be sure to deny that David Eccles was the father of my child. He said that it would be terrible for him if I testified that he was the father of my child."

The Silas W. Eccles referred to was formerly traffic manager of the Oregon Short Line Railroad and a non-Mormon of pronounced type.

That Mrs. Geddes remembered her instruction when she testified in Washington is indicated in her answers to questions there on this subject. In the record of the Smoot proceedings of December 13, 1904, (volume 2, page 105) the following is printed:

Mr. Tayler—Who is your second husband?

Mrs. Geddes—I have no second husband.

Mr. Tayler—Who is the father of your youngest child?

Mrs. Geddes—I decline to answer that question.

Mr. Tayler—Is his name Echols? (Eccles.)

Mrs. Geddes—No, sir.

Mr. Tayler—It is not?

Mrs. Geddes—No, sir.

Mrs. Geddes was married as a plural wife to William S. Geddes on December 4, 1884, having come to Utah as a Mormon convert earlier in that year. William S. Geddes, who was an employee of David Eccles, died in June, 1891.

In 1897 David Eccles made ardent love to Mrs. Geddes, according to her testimony at Ogden, and in the summer of 1898 they were "married" polygamously about dark in the offices of the Eccles Lumber company at Ogden, Apostle Marriner W. Merrill of the Mormon church performing the supposed ceremony. Eccles was already a polygamist.

In both cases—that of her first husband and that of Eccles, each being a polygamous union—Mrs. Geddes was compelled to hide her relations, living under assumed names and moving about from place to place to escape detection as a plural wife or to avoid being taken into court as a witness in any proceeding which might arise against either of her husbands.

When the general public rumor, opinion and sentiment were fully concentrated against Mrs. Geddes as the mother of a supposedly "fatherless" son, the bishop of Plain City, Utah, threatened investigation and possible excommunication from the church. Eccles went to the office of the first presidency of the Mormon church and procured the intervention of that body to stop the bishop's activity. This he succeeded in doing by having a restraining letter delivered to the bishop.

In the Ogden trial George F. Gibbs, secretary to the first presidency of the Mormon church, testified that Eccles had admitted to him that he was the father of Mrs. Geddes's boy. This testimony was given on July 2, 1915. He also said that the restraining letter had been sent by the first presidency to the bishop of Plain City. He further testified that the president of the church held that the manifesto of 1890 applied only to marriages in the United States and that the president (Lorenzo Snow) had advised those who desired to take plural wives to do so in Mexico.

President Joseph F. Smith, on July 8, 1915, in the Ogden trial, was asked if there had been any polygamous marriages in the church since issuance of the inhibitive manifesto in 1890. He replied: "I am sorry to say that there have. He said, too, that two apostles who had publicly ex-

pressed views contrary to the sentiment of the manifesto had been "dealt with;" but he admitted that Apostle Merrill, who had performed the Eccles-Geddes ceremony had not been taken to task about it.

In this connection it must be noted that President Smith had full knowledge of the offending of Merrill in performing the ceremony and of the offense of Eccles in taking a polygamous wife in defiance of the manifesto, which was approved in conference in October, 1890, and therefore became the law of the church.

At first the church and its publicists denied emphatically that there had been any polygamous marriages in the church after the manifesto. They each knew that this was not the truth. When proofs of such marriages were publicly offered, with neither of the culprits daring to step forward and make denial, there was less denial on the part of the church. When a formidable list of such offenders was published and reiterated, the statement was finally made in conference that there had been "a few sporadic cases." The admission of President Smith at the Ogden trial only partly uncovers the perfidy of the higher Mormon priesthood in the matter of suppression.

It must be remembered that this suppression of facts is less for the purpose of protecting the offenders than it is intended to obscure the perfidy of the leaders in permitting such lawlessness.

In the case of the two apostles who had been dealt with on account of holding views that were "unorthodox," they had spoken publicly and they were therefore "found out." In the case of Apostle Merrill, who performed the Eccles-Geddes ceremony, the matter had been kept secret to the entire satisfaction of the Mormon hierarchs—he was not "found out." Not until both Merrill and Eccles were dead did the facts in this particular case come out.

There have been published 230 names of new polygamists and it is safe to say that this list does not represent more than ten per cent of such offenders since 1890.

MORMONISM VERSUS OUR GOVERNMENT

Frances J. Diefenderfer

An attempt to outline clearly the relation between the Rocky Mountain Saints, better known as Mormons, and our United States Government is most difficult. Approach to the Governing Body of Mormonism is surrounded by innumerable complications. We recognize at once their intrigue, cunning and strategy that cannot be dealt with un-

less radical means are used, while those who hold to radical views are frequently denounced as fanatics and slaves of prejudice. When our government was founded on the principles of Republicanism, a constitution was formulated. That official document contains the following: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion." The Supreme Court of the United States has decreed that "no organization can in the name of religion be permitted to commit crime."

The frequent and avowed determination of the leaders of the Mormon Church to control all affairs of state has been openly shown and proved many times since statehood was granted. At almost every ecclesiastical conference held, the head of the church asserts the right and power of the priesthood to dictate the political conduct of the people. This direction comes to the high priest through the gift of revelation. In Pratt's "Key to Theology," (Page 70), reference is made to the power of the Melchisedec Order, or Governing Body, composed of fifteen men, namely, the president, two councillors and twelve apostles. This priesthood is called the priesthood after the Order of the Sons of God. It holds the keys of all the true principles of government in all worlds. "The nation and Kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish." This priesthood, including also that of the Aaronic (next in order) holds the keys of revelation of the Oracles of God to Man upon the earth. It has the power and right "to give laws and commandments to individuals, churches, rulers, nations and the world; to appoint, ordain and establish constitutions and kingdoms; to appoint kings, presidents, governors and judges." Mormon books universally refer to the material and political supremacy of the Mormon priesthood as the only rightful governing power in the universe.

B. H. Roberts in one of his recent books called "New Virtues for God," says: "Men who hold the priesthood possess divine authority, thus to act for God, and by possessing part of God's power, they are in reality, part of God." These quotations taken from the sacred books of the Mormon

people show at once the arrogant, priestly assumption of control in all things,—a theocracy existing without molestation or interruption within our free Republic. Their removal to the sparsely settled western portion of our country, in the early days of their history, gave opportunity to lengthen their cords and strengthen the "stakes of Zion," while they gathered to their faith large numbers of misguided innocent victims.

In 1847 Brigham Young established a provisional government called the "State of Deseret," over which he proclaimed himself king. His power was supreme. The sacred orders enjoined oaths and penalties. Vengeance was declared against a government that presumed to interfere. Polygamy was an early tenet, obedience the command, and secrecy the order enjoined upon all. The leaders of the system were emboldened by their success and the belief that our government was established upon a broad basis—so free and liberal in its provision that they could enter the very midst and establish a temporal kingdom that would eventually overthrow our government. The years that followed this usurpation of authority were years of darkened history for many of the poor suffering devotees of their faith.

Perhaps the most interesting period in Mormon history occurred just preceding and during the enactments that gave statehood to Utah. The Woodruff "Manifesto" issued in September, 1890, pledged a monogamous future, notwithstanding the fact that the petition through which universal amnesty was obtained declared that polygamy was only "suspended." The revelation remained. Joseph F. Smith was chosen President of the Mormon

Church, November 10th, 1901. At that time he was not a capitalist. Today he is president of a score or more of commercial enterprises. Independent of these, he receives one-tenth of all the earnings of all Mormons, for the tithe is his. Every Mormon holding a government position, paid from the treasury of our nation, gives a tithe to this king of grafters. Public officials, paid out of the treasury of the State, also give their tithe. Every Mormon school teacher pays one-tenth of his or her earnings to support this hierarchal potentate. Business competition in Mormon centers make it almost impossible for a Gentile to live among them. The ruling authorities of the Mormon Church direct the teaching of "Religion Classes" in the school houses of Utah. This is not only contrary to the general laws governing the use of school houses put is also expressly forbidden by the Constitution of the State of Utah, (See Art. I Section 4). Such teaching is also prohibited by a statute of the State. In political affairs the domination of the first presidency and apostles is transmitted through ecclesiastical channels. This is easily accomplished through their wonderful organization. This was demonstrated recently when Governor Spry openly announced that President Smith had ordered him to veto the state Prohibition Bill.

Some speakers and writers declare that the old Mormonism is passing, and that the system will change under the leadership of the younger generations. Do not be beguiled into such belief. "The Melchisedec Order" is self-perpetuating. There is a perfect union of church and state. Before Reed Smoot could place his name in nomination as U. S. Senator, he was

forced to secure the "consent" of the church, because "The Priesthood is vested with supreme authority in all things spiritual and temporal." Their doctrine is the same now that it has always been. The only cure for these evils is certain legislation that will force the leaders to obey the laws.

1. A National Constitutional Amendment to forbid polygamy and polygamous living.

2. A proceeding by the Department of Justice to force a correct accounting of the property held in trust by the Mormon Kingdom and to dissolve that trusteeship as a combination.

3. An order by the Post Office Department withholding the privilege of the mails as long as they teach the crime of Polygamy, and such insidious teachings as are contained in the Mormon Books.

4. A refusal by each House of Congress to seat any man who pays political allegiance to the Mormon Kingdom.

5. A refusal by the President to appoint to any Federal position, any man who pays political allegiance to the Mormon Kingdom, for the Mormon Kingdom is a polygamous institution under the rule of a false prophet who holds that his authority is superior to all civil powers.

We therefore insist that all churches have equal rights in this country.

We insist that the Mormon Church shall have no more privileges than any other church.

We insist that the Temporal Mormon Kingdom shall cease to exist in this country.

Erie, Pa.

CRUSADE NOTES

Communications have recently gone to the officers of over three hundred higher church courts of various denominations in all parts of the country, asking them to endorse our anti-Mormon platform and program of action. The highest courts in session last Spring of a number of the different denominations heartily endorsed both the platform and the program.

* * * * *

Mrs. Frances J. Diefenderfer, President of the Order of Anti-Polygamy Crusaders spoke at Chautauqua, N. Y., the 18th of August, immediately following her work at Winona Lake, Ind. She also spoke at Meadville, Pa., the early part of September and spent the latter part of the month in Canada. She expects to spend the early part of October in Chicago and the remainder of the month in Pennsylvania.

* * * * *

Senator Cannon who spoke daily in New York and in the New England States during the summer under the auspices of the Redpath Lyceum Bureau, began work again under the auspices of our Association the first of this month. He and the General Superintendent are to spend the first week of October in Kansas City, Mo., the second in Chicago, Ill., the third in St. Louis, Mo., and the fourth in Pittsburgh and vicinity. Mass meetings have been arranged for each evening during these weeks. These arrangements were made in Kansas City and Chicago by the local Church Federations, in St. Louis by the Ministerial Association and other Christian organizations and in Pittsburgh by the officers of the National Reform Association. The month of November is to be spent in Philadelphia and New York City and vicinity.

* * * * *

At the opening of the next session of this present congress in December, Representative Gillett of Massachusetts is to reintroduce the Anti-Polygamy Amendment in the lower house and

Senator Thomas of Colorado is to reintroduce it in the upper house.

* * * * *

The recent Geddes-Eccles, State University and State-wide Prohibition cases in Utah have resulted in much publicity detrimental to the Mormon system. It all justifies our anti-Mormon movement and at the same time emphasizes greatly its timeliness. Our publicity manager writes: "We feel that the issue is now fairly understood in the newspaper offices of the country and that the story will eventually 'break' in the news. We will win out and do all we set out to do if we do not lose our heads or our courage. I am more interested in the conflict now than ever and more hopeful as to its ultimate outcome."

* * * * *

Mrs. Lulu L. Shepard, President of the Utah State W. C. T. U., favored the officers of the Order of Anti-Polygamy Crusaders and also of the National Reform Association at their committee meetings the 13th ult. She spoke at each on the subject of Mormonism and agreed to address the annual convention of the National Reform Association, to be held in Pittsburgh the 6th and 7th of December next, on that subject.

* * * * *

The General Superintendent spent two days each the latter part of the past month in Chicago and Kansas City in conference with local committees in charge of the mass meetings to be held in these cities this month. He was also in Olathe, Kansas, and Independence, Mo., in each of which places arrangements were made for an Anti-Mormon mass meeting.

* * * * *

Every day the office receives letters of commendation regarding the Christian Statesman. These indicate that the magazine is one of real worth. As such its subscription list should be greatly increased. Each reader should be enlisted in the campaign to secure five thousand new readers before January first.

PEACE BASED ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE

PRAYING FOR PEACE

Henry Collin Minton, D.D.

A clergyman said not long ago that he did not pray for peace because he did not believe that the time for peace had yet come. The remark starts one to thinking. Is it a good reason for refusing to pray for a good thing that we do not think that the time for the good thing has arrived? Is peace a good thing? Is the kind of peace that we pray for and that God would give, ever untimely or premature? Can we not trust God to suit the answer to the need of the hour of its coming? Are we never to pray for a blessing when we can not see how it can come—are we never to pray in the dark?

These are academic, theological queries; but how about the questions raised in the concrete world of fact? Is peace now impossible? Or, if it come now, must it be other than the real thing? Is the map of military strategy, is the existing status in diplomacy, is the animus of the belligerent nations, are the veiled plans and schemes of crowns and cabinets, such as to render any peace which a prayer-answering God may send, a **contra tems**, an absurdity, an impossibility?

We do not so understand it. We judge such a view to be inconsistent either with a true conception of the present situation or with the Christian believer's idea of the power of prayer.

The man who prays right must believe that things impossible to man are possible with God. Mr. Huxley was frank enough to say that his reason for

disbelieving that miracles ever occurred was not that God was not able to work them but that he did not regard the evidence strong enough to convince him that God did work them. God can not work impossibilities but Jonathan Edwards was right in saying that an impossibility is not "a thing."

If we are to pray only for the things that we can see the way in which God can bring them to pass, then we will limit the province of God's answer to the narrow range of our own little reason and knowledge. The little girl that prayed for rain on a parched and cloudless morning and then carried her umbrella in confident expectation of the coming shower, had faith in God. The consulting physicians agree that the patient can not recover and yet how often he does! The king's heart is hardened, like Pharaoh's: the people are mad with hate and the land is ablaze with the fires of war; what of it? The king's heart is in God's hand. His spirit can move upon the people like an eastwind upon fields of waving grain. The diplomatists of yesterday have faced about today. We say "how strange! how sudden! how unforeseen and unexpected! "Standeth God within the shadows keeping watch above His own."

No man prays right who has forgotten how small is his knowledge and how vast and dense is his own ignorance. We fail to find the clue to many a maze of life. We can complain about what we receive but we should often be embarrassed to tell first what it is that we want. We shall one day thank God for not answering many a

prayer in which, in the more clearly revealing light, we shall see that we asked amiss. The man from New Jersey who, with his wife and daughter, was visiting friends in Chicago was bitterly disappointed when, on account of sickness, he was unable to join the party on a holiday excursion one bright morning a few weeks ago; but afterward, he found that the cause of that disappointment saved his life from the death that overtook hundreds in that awful tragedy of the ill-fated Eastland.

The hand that answers prayer finds many a clue we never suspect and solves many a perplexing problem that fills us with despair. Prayer does avail. "More things are true, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy." Not many mighty works were done there because of their unbelief. Ordinary psychology tells us we must believe in another if that other is to help us. Skepticism chills and sometimes kills social influences for good. The divine forces are exceedingly sensitive. If God is to help me I must believe in Him. Doubt is a non-conductor. The subtle skepticism that lurks in the hidden folds of a flabby faith, paralyzes the energies of a hesitating church and closes the channels against the omnipotent spirit.

Our Lord taught us to pray "Thy kingdom come." He did not tell us how or when it will come; our ignorance may well leave something to God. "The Kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." Peace is the normal condition of mankind. Bernhardt's philosophy that war is normal is the philosophy of Hades. God never meant that this world should be a pandemonium of Mephistopheles. Peace is a blessing and the Prince of Peace

taught his disciples to pray for it. His kind of peace can never come too soon. He who hears the prayer can bring about the answer. When we doubt God's promise we limit the Infinite and bar the very boon we pray for. We do not pray for an armed truce; or for an angry temporary armistice; or for a mere suspension of hostilities. God's meaning of peace presupposes the moral conditions, the spiritual frames, that characterize and constitute a situation worthy of the name.

We may not, we do not, see how it will come. It is not absurd or impossible that peace should be concluded at almost any time. The world may be surprised by the methods, the means, and the time of the peace that will come. The strain is tremendous and cannot last always. The resources of the fighting nations are by no means inexhaustible. The righteous protest that comes up from every bleeding nation, though it may be unspoken, is not unfelt. It is said that 72 men brought on this cruel world-war, affecting 400,000,000. Those kings and chancellors are far more truly in the hands of Almighty God than the subject millions are in their hands. The war itself is a great, historic stupendous apostasy from God.

Let the voice of prayer continue in every church and chapel that bears the holy name of the blessed Christ. Let not faith in God's power to create the conditions without which there can indeed be no peace for one moment, falter or fail. They say that this war is multiplying skeptics in certain quarters; let us rather say the skeptics are prolonging the war if indeed they did not bring it to pass. When we regard any blessing as too difficult or

too big or too good for God to grant, that moment we have degraded God and placed a limited being on his throne. We must believe in God. We must love his kingdom more than we love the Black Eagle, the Lion, the Tricolor or even the Stars and Stripes. We love these earth-born standards because they are loyal to the God-given standard which is forever supreme. Jesus Christ is the supreme authority, King over all kings and Lord over all

lords, and never will the human heart in the silent solitudes of the soul, or the human race, among the great nations of the earth, find true peace, the peace of God which passeth understanding, the peace which this world can not give and which it cannot take away, until the world is ready, without reservation or hesitation, to ask God for the coming of His kingdom and the doing of His will.

THE BIBLE IN THE SCHOOLS CAMPAIGN

A MOTHER'S SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

The receipt from us of the July issue of the Christian Statesman and other special Bible in the School literature by the Rev. J. C. Ellis of Homewood, Miss., has elicited the following from his wife, together with a letter expressing their high appreciation of our effort in behalf of Christian public education.

The injunction to "Train up a child in the way he should go" places a great responsibility on the parents. I feel it my duty, and the duty of every other parent, to study, plan, labor, sacrifice, economize, suffer, pray, and "Whatsoever our hands find to do," to do it for the betterment, the uplifting, the developing and the educating of our children.

They are jewels God has entrusted to our keeping to prepare them to launch out into the world, to shoulder their part of the activities and responsibilities of life. Shall we be guilty of handicapping them by seeing them approach the arena of life, half-prepared or not prepared at all? God forbid.

Ye people of God, ye educators of our land, bestir the parents to a realization of the duty they owe their children. "We must educate, we must educate, or we must perish by our own prosperity."

God does not require us to soar to the mountain heights, or to the lofty peaks of ambition and accomplish some great feat that will astound the world. He simply requires us to be faithful, do the best we can and not despise to do well the little things of life. He will take care of the consequences and results.

"Be thou faithful unto death." Be faithful to your country, to your home, to your child, to the duties that surround you in life, and a reward is awaiting you. Do not be uneasy.

Unfaithfulness in anything, much more in the education of our children, is the worst stab, the greatest stumbling-block, the deepest precipice, the strongest hindrance to advancement and upward progress of the human race.



FOR THE DEFENSE OF OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

The following from the Literary Digest presents an important aspect of the public school question.

To Be-German the Public Schools

There have been sections of our country, like the Scandinavian Northwest, which have tried to further a movement to introduce the teaching in

the public schools of the mother tongue of the predominant foreign population. It has been based on the sentimental wish to preserve the traditions as well as accents of the home country and has seemed to have no political significance. Perhaps it is only this that inspires our German Americans in enunciating one plank of their platform of the National German-American Alliance at its annual convention in San Francisco. Alongside the decree of a new holiday—American day—the 19th of October, the anniversary of the surrender of Cornwallis, in order, explains *The Nation* (New York), "that we should never forget that on that day we freed ourselves from British control," comes the announcement that "leagues are to be formed in every State for the promotion of laws establishing the right to education in German, and safeguarding such instruction." There is even more in view:

"The formation of classes of children outside the schools for instruction in German songs and poetry and in the language is to be undertaken at once. The collecting of material about the deeds of the German pioneers and the part they have played in our history is to be systematically organized and encouraged; and German libraries are to be enlarged or founded. The Turner movement is to be revived and furthered. Our German public school teachers are to be shown how to teach history from the German point of view, and, of course, the teaching of German is to be a part of all public school courses hereafter, as well as instruction in German history and **Deutsche Kultur**."

Upon all this *The Nation* has a view that perhaps was overlooked by those planning so beneficent a work:

"Summed up, therefore, the whole German-American program is that citizens of this country of Teutonic origin shall remain a separate group, retaining their traditions, customs, and language, and preserving their own culture, not acquiring ours. They are to be Americans and yet not Ameri-

cans. As Prof. Julius Goebel, of the University of Illinois, put it in a book published before the outbreak of the European War, in January, 1914, the German-American, the 'scion of a noble race,' declines to permit himself to be cast into the melting-pot of American life, to emerge reformed into a factory-like type, 'by the common mold' by which ordinary Americans are stamped. To make German-born Americans, or those with German blood in their veins just like ordinary American citizens is to decree, the professor says, the destruction of everything that is holy 'in our (that is, the German) national character.' Not unnaturally, his view of our American future is of an 'American people filled with German ideals'; for not only is the German-American to be allowed to keep all his customs and his language, but, so Professor Goebel asserts, the sole hope for our American institutions, sunk so low as to make all 'thinking persons ask how much longer can this country rule itself,' is the 'infusion of our American life with German **Kultur** and ideals, German sense of honor and of duty.'

"Now, men like Professor Goebel and the members of the German-American League are so convinced that everything German is superior to everything else on earth that it is hardly worth while to reason with them. For instance, it would be idle to remind them that other groups in our country believe in their ideals and customs and languages. What is to become of us if each of our numerous groups, the Scandinavian, the Jewish, the French, the Hungarians, and Czechs, were to insist on their language and their history in our schools, and refuse likewise to be molded into good Americans by the common melting-pot of our life and politics? Are we to be not a nation, but a collection of groups of citizens of different thoughts and ideals? Already in Chicago the Bohemians are paying out of their own pockets for schools using the Bohemian language. In Minnesota the Scandinavian tongues are taught in more and

more schools; in its largest city there is to be a 'house of life' from which Scandinavian **Kultur** and ideals are to be spread throughout the land. What is to become of American ideals and our **Kultur** and our varied contributions to mankind, our social and political additions to human knowledge and human happiness and the science of government? Well, our foreign-born citizens may be certain of one thing: our native American ideals will never be subordinated to any made in Germany or elsewhere, for the word 'American' stands for things political, spiritual, moral, and humanitarian that are unsurpassed. But we are grateful to Professor Goebel, the German-American Alliance, and others for their giving us due warning of their intentions for the future."



DAY OF PRAYER FOR SCHOOLS

The First United Presbyterian Church, Wilkesburg, Pa., observed the Day of Prayer for Schools by arranging a special evening service to which all the public school teachers of Wilkesburg were invited. Messrs. J. L. Allison, Superintendent of the Wilkesburg schools, and W. M. Davidson, Superintendent of the Pittsburgh schools, each delivered addresses. The pastor of the church, the Rev. George E. Raitt, D.D., was in charge of the service.

"The Neglected Factors in Public Education" was the theme discussed by the Pastor of the Friendship Park Methodist Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh, September 12th, the Day of Prayer for Schools.

"I read with pleasure and profit the literature you sent on the Bible and Christian Education in our public schools, and will preach and pray with all might and faith upon that splendid theme next Sabbath morning. No one could be more interested than I." Thus wrote the Rev. M. E. McLinn, pastor of the St. Mark Lutheran Church, Crafton, Pa., the 9th ult.

The office force spent considerable time this past summer in correspondence in the interests of the Day of Prayer for Schools—the second Lord's Day of September. Fully five thousand letters were sent to as many different pastors in all sections of the United States, in addition to the tens of thousands reached through the religious press. The personal response to the announcements thus made of the day and the offer of literature to those who would observe it were most gratifying and, as a result, the Day of Prayer for Schools was much more widely observed this year than ever before. Our publicity agent wrote: "Every nook and corner of America has been covered on the Day of Prayer proposition and the campaign will be a splendid success if the clergymen do their part. We have not stinted either time, money or effort to make it a success." The July issue of the Christian Statesman, the special Bible in the Schools number, to the extent of thousands, was sent to all ministers agreeing to preach, the second Lord's Day of September, on some phase of Christian Public Education.

Reports of sermons preached in response to this request have been received from many quarters and extracts from them will be given in the next issue of the Christian Statesman.



DR. MARSCHNER ON MORAL TRAINING.

Citizens paying school-taxes should have the right to insist that morality is taught in our Public Schools, and which text-book should be used. There is no doubt that a plebiscitum would favor the Bible as text-book, since experience teaches that those who conform their lives to this book constitute the most desirable citizens of our country. Our police force and penitentiaries have to be kept up on account of citizens who do not conform their lives to the Bible. Should,

then, the good men pay taxes of all kinds, merely in order to make people intelligent and smart? If Christ is the greatest moral teacher who ever lived,

His morality should certainly be instilled into the minds of all prospective citizens of a country which claims to be a "Christian" country.

CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP INSTITUTE

The Eleventh Annual Christian Citizenship Institute at Winona Lake, Ind., August 9-19, was in many respects the best ever held there. While the people on the Winona Grounds this year, as at most other Assemblies, were fewer in number than in former years, the average attendance at the meetings of our Institute—both in our own auditorium and that of the Winona Assembly—was as large as if not indeed larger than in any previous year.

The first week of the Institute was given exclusively to the consideration of the subject of Mormonism and the principles involved in the successful handling of the same. The subject was discussed in a fundamental way by many speakers and from many points of view, and in the main before manifestly interested audiences. The eagerness with which so many in the audiences availed themselves of the opportunity to secure copies of the anti-polygamy and other resolutions to be adopted by organizations to which they belong in their respective communities, and forwarded to their senators, representatives and other national officials at Washington was proof sufficient of their interest, to say nothing of the readiness with which they purchased copies of "The Survey of the Mormon Kingdom." Ordinarily, many queries were propounded at the close of the addresses in the pavilion or National Reform auditorium, where it had been previously announced that such would be welcomed. These were fully and ably answered by the speakers, Mrs. Frances J. Diefenderfer of Erie, Pa., Mrs. Sarah Ernest Snyder of Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mrs. H. B. McAfee of Chicago, Ill., and the General Superintendent of the National Reform Association, who presided at all the meetings. A number of the questions asked revealed the fact that while there was a deep latent interest among many on the subject of Mormonism their knowledge of the present status of that system of iniquity in our country is rather limited. This we find to be true generally. Hence the great need for a campaign of education. The Winona meetings can scarcely fail to be helpful in this respect, as well as in the way of securing action in many communities, in the several States represented by the attendants at the Institute, favoring the carrying out of the Anti-Mormon program adopted by our Association. Want of space forbids our mentioning in detail the arguments advanced by the several speakers, including Attorney A. D. Gash of Chicago and Dr. John Royal Harris of Pittsburgh, as well as those above named. They were all able and along the lines with which our readers are more or less familiar. The substance of some of the addresses will be found elsewhere in this issue. Others will appear in later issues.

The second week of the Institute was given to the discussion of such themes as Intemperance, International Peace, Family Life, Christian Public Education, The Sabbath, and the Christian Principles of Civil Government. The speakers were the Rev. George H. L. Beeman of Orrville, Ohio, Dr. Harry L. Bowlby of New York City, Dr. Henry Collin Minton of Trenton, N. J., Drs. T. H. Acheson and James S. Martin of Pittsburgh. It

goes almost without saying that these discussions were pointed and in every way able. While the average attendance at the meetings this second week was perhaps not quite so large as the attendance at the meetings the previous week, (which was no doubt attributable in part to other conflicting meetings at times on the Assembly Grounds), still there was a fair attendance at all the meetings and at some, notably the last held in the Assembly Auditorium, the largest attendance of any of the entire Institute. This and the closing meeting in the National Reform Auditorium were addressed by Dr. Bowlby in the interests of better Sabbath observance.

Dr. Bowlby pointed out the dangers of Sabbath desecration and sought to impress his hearers with the duty of protecting this Day of days. Dr. Minton, who discussed national ethics in connection with the war in Europe, pleaded for national allegiance to God and right and for the preservation of neutrality and honorable peace. Dr. Martin, who discussed among other themes, "War—Its Cause and Cure," insisted that the procuring cause of

war among nations, as among men, is sin, national sin in the case of nations, and that the cure in the one case is the same as in the other, viz., the acceptance and practice by each of the principles taught by the Prince of Peace.

Dr. Acheson gave most informing addresses on the Sabbath, Marriage and Divorce, the Bible in the Public Schools. In each he pleaded earnestly for the application of Christian principles of government in affairs of state. The Rev. Mr. Beeman declared the Sabbath to be America's most vital institution, and gave statistics at length to show the progress of the fight against the traffic in intoxicating drinks in our country, encouraging his hearers to look forward to a saloonless nation in 1920.

The distinguishing feature of practically all the addresses, attended by a total of thousands of people representing one half or more of the States of the Union, was their repeated declaration that applied Christianity is the only real and final solution of every great national problem.

TIDINGS FROM OUR SECRETARIES

LETTER FROM DR. J. S. McGAW GENERAL FIELD SECRETARY

Among the hundreds of conventions held in California this year in connection with the Panama-Pacific Exposition there has been none more important than the World Social Purity Congress held in the Civic Auditorium in San Francisco, July 18 to 24 inclusive. Fundamental to the nation's life is the battle now being waged for clean blood and pure social life. It was our privilege to speak on the topic "The Bible in the Public School and Social Purity." "What we would put into the nation's character we must put in the nation's schools. The Bible

through the centuries has been the mightiest of books for the cleansing of the nations. Nothing like it has ever been discovered for purging the mind of filthy thoughts and the soul of low ideals. No better means could be invented for the conveyance of purity teaching in the school room than the Scripture text and Bible story. The teacher is greatly handicapped who has to work without its aid. It is not only the right but the duty of the State to make the school curriculum a mighty force for the banishment of obscenity, the red light district, the white slave traffic, the heinous divorce laws and loose marriage ideals together with polygamy wherever practiced under

the flag. The Bible not only presents the highest standard but the greatest incentive, and if the State in its wisdom sees fit to use the Bible for its own protection it has a perfect right to do so. If only half of the reported delinquency among the young people of California schools is fact there is abundant reason for pressing the campaign for the use of the Book."

Of equal importance was the World Lord's Day Congress held in Oakland, July 27 to August 1. The man who has no Sabbath will soon have no religion. With no religion he will soon have no God. With no God he will soon have no conscience. With no conscience he will have no respect for the rights of fellowmen and the result is lawlessness and anarchy. There is always an increase of crime where the Sabbath is neglected and the Bible banished from the public schools. The two great time-honored Christian civil institutions, the Sabbath and the family, constitute the chief moral safe-guards of the nation. And the homeborn or alien who strikes at them virtually fires on the flag.

It was our task to present "The Best Method for Combining Our Influence to Strengthen Sabbath Observance."

The Ventura Chautauqua is one of the intellectual and moral citadels of the State of California. For seven years it has held most successful assemblies. It was our pleasure to deliver the lecture on Saturday afternoon and the sermon, on the morning and evening of the closing day. The highly evangelical tone of this Chautauqua made us feel perfectly at home while presenting the principles of the Kingdom of God as they apply to national life.

Carpenteria is the business and social center of a beautiful fertile valley ten by two and a half miles in area, noted for its healthful climate and wonderful productivity. Through the personal efforts of Rev. Anderson Crain of the Presbyterian Church and Rev. Robin Gould of the Methodist Episcopal Church (South) a union

mass meeting of the churches was arranged for Sabbath morning. The Town Hall Association granted the use of the auditorium. The advertising for the meeting was well done. A good audience was present and an interested hearing accorded the speaker. In the evening we addressed a Union Meeting of the Lutheran, Congregational and Christian Churches of Santa Barbara. Rev. George H. Greenfield of the Congregational Church and Rev. G. P. Goll of the Lutheran Church were present and rendered valuable assistance in the service. The pastor of the Christian Church was absent on his vacation. A hearty note of thanks followed the address and a movement was begun to hold a union meeting of all of the churches of the city in the near future.

Several months ago arrangements were made for a union meeting of the churches of Monrovia. A heavy rain prevented many from attending. On July 25th we again visited this city and were greeted by a large audience in the open air auditorium of the high school. Rev. George Lord of the Baptist church presided and pastors of other churches participated in the service. The citizenship of the town is above the average in intelligence and morality. We appreciated the occasion very much and were assured that much good had been accomplished.

In response to the invitation of Rev. George R. Graff of the Methodist Episcopal Church of San Fernando we occupied his pulpit and were cheered by the interest manifested by his congregation. On the evening of August 22 we spoke in the Methodist Episcopal Church of Gardena. The pastor Rev. John Nicholson had used every possible means to make the meeting a success. A good appreciative audience was present. We greatly enjoyed the fellowship of this brother and his people.

It was our privilege to address two congregations of the Reformed Presbyterian Church within the last month. One in Santa Ana of which Rev. George E. Greer is the pastor and the

other in Los Angeles of which the Reverend P. J. McDonald is the pastor. In this connection we recall that it was John Knox who gave to America the idea of a public school system. In his first Book of Discipline he made provision for a school in every parish, a college in every principal town and three universities in the kingdom. Carlyle says of him "All honor to the brave and true. All honor to brave old Knox, the bravest of the true; who, at the very first glimpse of the success of his cause, said 'Let the people be taught' and sent the school master in all parts of the realm." The substantial financial and enthusiastic spiritual response we received from these two congregations satisfied us that they had lost none of the love for the public school or the Word of God cherished by their distinguished ancestors.

San Diego has what is known as the Open Forum Lecture Bureau. The purpose of this institution is to furnish a platform and an audience where free speech on almost any subject can be enjoyed. While by no means a necessary consequence yet it is a fact that it is used almost entirely by atheists, infidels, agnostics, sceptics, socialists of a certain type and anarchists. Not long ago we received a very cordial invitation from Mr. A. Lyle DeJarnette the director, to present the subject of the Bible in the Public Schools. We accepted the invitation and arrangements were made to speak on the morning of Sabbath, August 29. A Mr. C. George Reidel, a friend of Bernard Shaw, a man of considerable scholarly attainments was booked to deliver a series of lectures on Socialism, anarchy, and kindred topics. When he learned that we were to speak on the Bible in the schools he asked that he might speak in the afternoon of the same day on "Why the Bible Should Not be Used in the Public Schools." The request was granted with the provision that the speaker of the morning have thirty minutes to make reply following the afternoon address. We spoke in the morning on "The Necessity for the Bible in the

Public Schools." The audience was larger than usual. A few were in sympathy with the speaker but most were not and many exceedingly bitter in their opposition. In the afternoon the house was packed and Mr. Reidel used his time in attempting to answer the morning address. We used twenty-five of the thirty minutes assigned to us in making reply. A letter from Mr. DeJarnette assures us that our opponent had learned a lesson and that friends for our cause had been made. The meeting lasted from four until six o'clock. Following the addresses morning and afternoon the audience asked questions. This was a very interesting and pleasant part of the program.

In marked contrast with the stormy sessions of the morning and afternoon was the union meeting held that evening in the Presbyterian church of La Jolla. Rev. H. Gough Birchby, the pastor, and Rev. Shelton Bissell of the Congregational church had done excellent work in arranging and advertising the meeting. The church was filled to its capacity. The genial atmosphere created by the enthusiasm and Christian heart interest of the pastors in the direction of the service produced the tonic needed by the speaker after the experiences of the day. At the close of the service we had the pleasure of meeting some warm friends of the work and was hospitably entertained in the home of one of them. We will long remember our pleasant visit to La Jolla.



LETTER FROM PENNSYLVANIA FIELD SECRETARY

It was comparatively easy to find openings for the presentation of National Reform principles during the month of August. Pastors away on vacations usually desire to make provision for their people during their absence. This year the openings were so many that a number of them could not be filled.

Three Sabbaths of the month of August were occupied in churches in the vicinity of my first pastoral charge. This was peculiarly pleasant to me as it afforded me an opportunity to meet old friends and many kind greetings were received from people who had listened to me in past years as I tried to present the truth of God in school-houses and churches of sister denominations.

At this season of the year there is probably no question of more interest to thoughtful and conscientious people than the preservation of our civil Sabbath. Pleasure seeking, in the estimation of many ministers and laymen, is encroaching upon the sanctity of God's holy day. In one village that I visited I was informed that one thousand vehicles had passed there the previous Sabbath. While this village was near a popular summer resort yet we hear the same complaint of Sabbath desecration in other neighborhoods. Many people leave home upon Saturday evening and do not return until Sabbath evening or Monday morning. Not only is the home sanctuary neglected but in too many cases people do not wait upon the ordinances of divine grace where they go. Pastors long for the automobile season to pass. Our nation needs to realize the sovereignty of our Lord Jesus Christ over his own day. We cannot well hope for this until we recognize His sovereignty over the nations of the world.

There are desires to have many other topics discussed and there seems to be no question that affords us a better opportunity of presenting the royal claims of our Lord than the question of International Peace based on the principles of the Prince of Peace. During the month I have spoken four times on this topic.

Pastors are now returning or have returned to their homes and opportunity is afforded to arrange for future appointments.

J. R. Wylie.

LETTER FROM REV. G. H. L. BEEMAN, LOCAL SECRETARY ORRVILLE, OHIO.

The writer arranged for a union service to hear Dr. James S. Martin, our National Superintendent. The service was really one of a series of union meetings held here during July and August. A large audience greeted Dr. Martin at Orrville, in the Lincoln Chautauqua tent, Sabbath morning, August 8th. The doctor gave one of his masterful addresses upon The Bible in our Public Schools, or "Christian Public Education." His address aroused much enthusiasm, and as he answered the opponents and piled up great arguments for the constant use of God's Word in the school room, the audience applauded with vigor. We hope Dr. Martin will come again.

Your local secretary has brought to the attention of pastors here the annual Day of Prayer for Public Schools, and he preached that day upon "Christianity in the Public Schools."

The Courier-Crescent gave the following report of the sermon:

The Day of Prayer for Public Schools was observed in the local Presbyterian church with a special sermon last Sunday upon "Christianity in Our Public Schools," by the pastor. The importance of such teachings as conform to the spirit of Christianity was set forth and the example of Christ was mentioned as a valuable aid to moral instruction in the schools. The teachings of Christ as set forth in the Bible should be given their due place in the schools. For the sake of the scholars' own moral life and for the sake of the nation's welfare, public school pupils should be taught their responsibility to God and be led to stand always for what is right. Moral instruction without reference to God would be ineffective. The Bible should be read in the public schools that pupils may be trained in good citizenship. Besides personal morality, the principles of national Christianity may well be taught in the schools, one of

which principles is that the ten commandments are embodied in our statutory laws and the nation in many ways recognize Almighty God.



NOTE FROM LOCAL SECRETARY

The sentiment against the liquor traffic is steadily growing. Prohibition forces are active. New prohibition territory is being gained every month almost, by local option elections. Unfortunately we have a wet governor, but he was not elected on the wet and dry issue. So far he does not appear to be actively promoting the liquor interests.

The social evil is receiving larger and larger attention. People are more than ever before recognizing that it is an evil. The old remedy, segregation, which was thought to be the solution of this evil is being more and more abandoned. Just a few days ago the mayor of one of the largest cities in Texas came out in a statement declaring segregation to be a false method of dealing with this evil.

There is also in many communities a strong sentiment against pool halls. People blame these places with being the resort of roughs and boot-leggers, and the promoters of gambling. Many communities have voted them out.

On the other hand the evil of cigarette smoking hardly receives a serious thought by the masses of people. There seems to be no public conscience on this matter at all. From

the way many prominent people indulge in this habit one might infer that nothing had been ever published or said about the pernicious effects of cigarette smoking.

Likewise Sabbath observance occupies a small place in the conscience of the people. Even prominent church people seem to have no scruples about employing a large part of the day for pleasure. The number who regard the day as a holy day is few, comparatively.

W. R. Gray, Corsicana, Texas.



ITEMS OF NEWS

Dr. James S. Martin, General Superintendent, addressed the annual convention of the Sabbath Schools of Johnston County, Kansas, in session at Overland Park the 21st ult. His theme was "The Place of the Bible in Public Education."

Dr. J. M. Wylie, Chairman of the Kansis City committee of the Church Federation under whose auspices anti-Mormon mass meetings are being held in that city, has been active in behalf of other lines of the Association's work in his community. He observed the Day of Prayer for Schools, himself preaching on Christian Public Education, and secured the publication of a letter in behalf of the same in the Kansas City Star, the leading daily of the city.

GENEVA COLLEGE BEAVER FALLS, PENNSYLVANIA

Founded sixty-five years ago by the type of men who later founded the CHRISTIAN STATESMAN.

Dedicated to the promulgation of the great ethical principles which underlie the economic, political and sociological questions of every age.

Conducted as an institution of higher learning with recognized collegiate standing affording a liberal education in the arts and sciences, with special reference to individual and collective responsibility for the well-being of the nation.

Persons desiring special training in the fundamentals of citizenship for the purpose of fitting themselves as social workers should communicate with the REGISTRAR, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania.